United Nations Development Programme

조선민주주의인민공화국주재
유엔개발계획대표부

‘Sustainable Energy Solutions for Rural Livelihoods in DPRK’ Project (SES)

Mid-term Review

Draft Final Report

Commissioned by UNDP DPRK

May-August 2018

Prepared by

Denika Blacklock

Independent Consultant

20 August 2018

Contents

Executive Summary

Overview

The mid-term review (MTR) of the Sustainable Energy Solutions for Rural Livelihoods in DPRK (SES) project has been commissioned by UNDP in order to provide an independent assessment for the Project Steering Committee and UNDP on the progress of project's delivery at the mid-point of the project, as well as identifying any changes that need to be made to the project's strategy to ensure its continuing relevance, effectiveness and increased potential for sustainability. The MTR will further identify initial lessons learned that can be used to reinforce project activities going forward.

SES addresses the problem of rural energy access by drawing upon the lessons from the SRED and SWEDPRA experiences. The project focuses on the attainment of effective and sustainable local energy solutions that generate positive impact among rural beneficiaries, rather than involving in technology development. The project has four building block outputs supporting the following outcome: 'Provide local rural communities in pilot areas with adequate, secure and reliable access to renewable energy resources, cost-effective energy efficiency and energy conservation solutions for meeting basic energy demands under appropriate operational modalities.'

The MTR was carried out using both inductive and deductive approaches, through four phases: desk review, data collection, analysis and drafting/finalization. A number of challenges emerged throughout the MTR process, including the limited data availability given the reduced access to community members due to poor weather. The MTR was also carried out simultaneously with the MTR for the CBDRM project, which added some logistical and data collection challenges where target communities overlapped. However, these challenges were planned for and managed throughout the MTR process.

Findings

Overall, the MTR found that the project is on track to meet most of its targets, with some significant delays in implementation due to operational and geopolitical challenges. A brief overview of the achievements is provided in Table 1.

Table 1. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for the SES Project

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
Project Strategy	N/A	This project is both extremely relevant to the current humanitarian context of DPRK, as well as to the priorities of the government to promote the use of renewable energy technologies, particularly in rural and remote areas which have had their energy access negatively impacted by the numerous extreme weather events. During the project design phase, it was assumed that energy interventions would benefit men more than women as improved livelihoods was a major focus of the project. However, the project has evolved over time to accommodate the shifting geopolitical landscape and a need to implement activities that are more traditionally humanitarian in nature. Therefore, the project has resulted in more impacts for woman and children than initially

		presumed, which will be important in terms of longer term humanitarian impacts. The RRF was very well designed, with a clear objective and outputs which build upon each other in order to present a strong chain of results. Activities are clearly defined, although some have been prioritized over others, including public buildings over households and less focus on improved biomass management. An important aspect of the project is that it builds from the SWEDPRA and SRED programmes, focusing only on proven RE and EE technologies that are accepted by the government based on the success of the two previous projects, as well as within the terms of acceptable goods for import within the sanctions regime currently imposed on the country.
Progress Towards Results	Output 1 Achievement Rating: 6	All targets for this output have been achieved and have been essential for identifying the energy gap (both electricity and thermal), suitable technologies in the local context, providing the enabling environment to proceed with the procurement and installation of RE and EE technologies
	Output 2 Achievement Rating: 5	There is mixed progress against targets for this output, with no progress being made in relation to improving biomass use in target communities. However, the lack of progress related to biomass activities does not undermine the impacts of the other activities under this output in terms of capacity building and planning
	Output 3 Achievement Rating: 5	Targets under this output have been achieved or are very likely to be achieved, which greatly improves local ownership and the likelihood of the sustainability and longer term humanitarian and livelihood impacts in the target communities
	Output 4 Achievement Rating: 5	While three of the four targets under this output have been achieved or are likely to be achieved, the delays in procurement related to the installation of RE technologies is a drawback. However, this does not overshadow the significant impacts made by the installations already completed, particularly in the health and education sectors.
Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	Achievement Rating:	While the project team has contingency plans for adjusting the annual work plans based on delays in procurement and RE installation, the continued delays which unduly impact the ability of the project team to deliver its activities indicate that the project has a high tolerance for uncertainty before changes in the work plan are implemented. The project team has been extremely capable at managing its resources and adjusting planning in order to ensure that the project makes the most efficient use of its time and money in light of the procurement challenges it has been facing. However, the project team is faced with many constraints, not least the issue of the banking channel, which impact how quickly it can access funds. The project team also makes good use of the in-kind contributions of communities related to structural works. It is evident that the project team are systematic in using field monitoring to identify issues and challenges – and any changes in

		project risks – and preparing detailed follow-up actions which are tracked in the field monitoring reports. Based on the management responses to issues and changes in risks, the project team, supported by the Country Office, rely heavily on field monitoring to ensure that the project is being implemented to the greatest extent possible given the operating environment, and use the information to determine how any changes to the project need to be made and when.
Sustainability	Rating: 3	Given the nature of RE and EE, the benefits of the project to date will be very sustainable in the short term, mostly sustainable in the medium term, and likely sustainable in the long term of county-level technical knowledge and energy planning and management capacities are improved and consolidated over the remainder of the project. An important aspect of this project is that the set-up of the NTDCs to support RE and EE installation and maintenance at the county-level also serves as an appropriate institution for the handover of responsibilities at the county level, which is a reasonable exit strategy for UNDP in light of the operational uncertainty that the Country Office is currently facing. However, while SES has put in place a number of processes (training, energy management plans, NTDCs) which would allow the counties to carry on with implementation should the SES project have to close due to operational constraints, there are a few issues which the project should plan for. The ongoing issue of delayed procurement due to sanctions issues will impact the finalization of RE and EE installations, as well as impact environmental sustainability of RE in that it undermines the ability of the project to support the application of fast rotation crops for agro-forestry, supporting both renewable energy options and disaster reduction in terms of reducing soil erosion and the risk of landslides.

The SES project builds on 10 years of UNDP programming in renewable energy, and benefits from the knowledge, leadership and commitment of line ministries. It is evident that knowledge and skills transfer has been successful in as far as the necessary technical skills to install, operate and maintain RE technologies, and to identify and install appropriate EE technologies based on the installation verification process undertaken by the project manager.

Beyond the programmatic results achieved by the project to date, it is important to note the quality of project management. The commitment of the team to see activities implemented to the benefit of target communities was evident both in interviews with the project team, as well as in the feedback and observations of the communities visited during this MTR. While both communities and government partners are frustrated in the lengthy delays in procurement related to RE technologies, there is nonetheless a deep appreciation for what the project team has done to date. Moreover, given the significant operational constraints faced by the project in all aspects of implementation, capacities for adaptive management are well-developed and are one of the main reasons the project is able to move forward, particularly in terms of soft interventions. The bundling of activities for more efficient implementation, resulting in outputs exceeding their targets, is one such example.

The SES project makes a significant contribution to UNDP's long-standing energy access portfolio, building on the achievements and lessons of SWEDPRA and SRED – using proven, locally available technologies which do not place a heavy burden on county stakeholders in terms of operations and maintenance. Moreover, SES is an excellent demonstration of the Country Office's willingness to learn and adapt its project approach based on the results of previous projects – in this case, using the lessons collected from the SRED project to refocus RE and EE installations on public buildings in order to have a wider and more equitable reach among community members.

Overall, the results achieved by the project to date are highly satisfactory and largely sustainable, particularly in terms of the impacts of EE technologies. RE technologies have had a substantial impact in relation to the reliability and quality of health and education service provision but will necessitate the consolidation of technical capacity gains among decision makers and engineers at the county level in order to ensure that any maintenance issues are quickly dealt with, and that replacement materials (i.e.: backup batteries) are planned and budgeted for in a timely manner.

Recommendations

Contingency planning for RE activities. It is recommended that the project develop a contingency plan whereby no RE activities can be implemented, refocusing on wider implementation of EE installations and consolidating knowledge gains among engineers and decision makers at the provincial and county level in order to prepare for (eventual) scale-up of the initiative by the government, including supporting such activities as in-country study tours, and bringing together national partners, including NTDCs to discuss and share lessons and areas for intervention.

Data collection on users of public buildings. In order to better understand the direct humanitarian impact of the project, it is recommended that the project team work closely with county-level stakeholders (i.e.: managers of public buildings and national consultants) to improve their data collection on how many people (disaggregated by sex, age, disability) access services, and the impacts that the RE and EE improvements have had on particular humanitarian outcomes, particularly health.

Improved qualitative data collection at the output level. Because the project engages in substantial capacity building of the enabling environment and individual technical capacity, it is critical that the project team monitor results of capacity building at the output level, beyond demonstrating the successful implementation of capacity building activities. Suggestions for qualitative output indicators have been provided.

Standardized monitoring tools. It is recommended that instead of having joint reports following field visits, whether or implementation and monitoring purposes, team members should submit individual BTORs, with project and programme aspects kept separate. A standardized quarterly monitoring report should be used to consolidate data from the BTORs on a quarterly basis only, providing ease in data analysis. This also provides a clear delineation between the role of the project and programme in monitoring and reporting at the project level.

Communication of project results. With the inclusion of more qualitative indicators at the output level, it is hoped that more meaningful analysis of the humanitarian importance of the project will be captured, and it is recommended that the UNDP Country Office put significantly more effort into communicating these results within the wider UN system in order to reinforce why UNDP's presence in DPRK is essential.

Exit Strategy. It is recommended that the project team prepare a strategy for the formal handover of tools and information that would be useful for future roll-out/scale-up to the six NTDCs which it is supporting.

Section 1: Introduction

Project Overview

DPRK's economy experienced a significant decline beginning in the late 1980s, and real per capita income, which reached a peak in 1987 has not yet regained lost ground. Economic hardship in DPRK was exacerbated in the 1990s by repeated natural disasters, including floods and severe droughts, with extreme flooding events in 2006, 2007, 2012 and 2013. Agriculture, road and hydraulic infrastructure, human settlements, and forest resources are severely affected by landslides and productive soils washed away by floods. The impacts of land degradation and deforestation are clearly visible in many parts of DPRK. In the energy sector, capital-intensive energy technologies are no longer be reliably and efficiently produced. De-capitalization is partly a manifestation of and partly a driving factor behind the economic decline and socioenvironmental degradation, including the return of less productive methods and technologies, involving an even larger demand for direct natural resources (land, firewood, water) and people's time.

Given these challenges and building on the results of the Sustainable Rural Energy Development (SRED) programme, the Sustainable Energy Solutions for Rural Livelihoods in DPRK (SES) project addresses problems in rural energy access by drawing upon the lessons from the SRED and SWEDPRA experiences. The project focuses on the attainment of effective and sustainable local energy solutions that generate positive impact among rural beneficiaries, rather than involving in technology development.

The project has four building block outputs supporting the following outcome: 'Provide local rural communities in pilot areas with adequate, secure and reliable access to renewable energy resources, cost-effective energy efficiency and energy conservation solutions for meeting basic energy demands under appropriate operational modalities.'

Output 1: Information about energy resources and feasible RE/EE solutions updated and made accessible to local beneficiaries.
Output 2: Increased technical know-how of county-level personnel for energy planning and sustainable management of local renewable energy resources.
Output 3: Strengthened supply chains for the delivery of appropriate RE/EE solutions for local communities in rural areas.
Output 4: Increased energy security and self-reliance of rural population through the implementation of RE/EE solutions for local communities.

Implemented through Direct Implementation Modality (DIM), the total budget for the project is USD 6.17 million of UNDP's own resources, to be implemented from 2016-2019. Project oversight is undertaken by UNDP with the guidance of the Project Steering Committee (PSC), chaired by the UNDP Deputy Resident Representative (DRR), with participation by the following government counterparts: Ministry of Electric Power Industry, State Academy of Sciences, State Committee of Science and Technology. For further information on the details of the project background and strategy, please refer to the Project Document.

Purpose and Scope of the Review

The mid-term review (MTR) of the SES project has been commissioned by UNDP in order to provide an independent assessment for the Project Steering Committee and UNDP on the progress of project's

delivery at the mid-point of the project, as well as identifying any changes that need to be made to the project's strategy to ensure its continuing relevance, effectiveness and increased potential for sustainability. The MTR will further identify initial lessons learned that can be used to reinforce project activities going forward. As such, one of the main objectives of the MTR, beyond the scope of the Terms of Reference (TORs) (See Annex 7), will be to identify lessons and recommendations that can help *consolidate* the evidence necessary to ensure that stakeholder ownership, particularly at the community level, and commitment to scale-up the interventions in the near term.

In line with the OECD's Development Assistance Criteria for evaluations, as well as the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Final Evaluations, this MTR will focus on the relevance, effectiveness, results and efficiency of the project to-date, as well as assess the likelihood of the sustainability and impact of the results in the medium and longer-term, within the political and operational context of DPRK. While focus will be placed on what has happened within the project to-date, as well as the challenges confronted, equal time will be spent on understanding where opportunities lie to improve effectiveness and the sustainability of project results. Lessons learned from a project-oriented development effectiveness lens will be assessed and presented. Although it was not part of MTR scope, this review also provides scenarios and way forward approach for UNDP programming in DPRK. Points of action deemed urgent and necessary to reinforce ongoing activities to improve the likelihood of sustainability of results in the medium-term and impact in the longer-term will also be presented for consideration by the project and UNDP.

This MTR does not focus on activity-based challenges to the project which do not have an impact on overall implementation or effectiveness. While it is important to understand how certain activities can or should have been planned or implemented better, such a focus would detract from the overall purpose of this review and are best addressed through regular project monitoring and management.

Summary of Contents

This report is divided into five sections, not including the Executive Summary and Annexes. The Introductory Section (Section 1) focuses on providing a concise overview of the project and the scope of the review. Section 2 outlines the approach that the evaluator has taken during the review process, the challenges and limitations that were accounted for and accommodated during the review, as well as a special, detailed sub-section on the political and operational context which impacts the implementation of the project. Section 3 forms the bulk of the report, providing the analysis of the findings of the review, answering questions laid out in the evaluation matrix of proxy indicators (See Annex 6). Lessons learned – both programmatic and operational – are provided in Section 4, while Section 5 provides conclusions on the progress of the project to date, an analysis of the adaptive management capacities of both the UNDP Country Office and Project Management Team, details urgent points of action and provides broader, project-oriented and programmatic recommendations for consideration by UNDP.

Section 2: Approach and Limitations of the Review

Approach of the Review

The MTR applied both inductive (identifying recurring themes and developing hypotheses about the project) and deductive (content analysis and understanding those themes) approaches to data collection (both qualitative and quantitative) and analysis, keeping in mind data scarcity within the context of the country where the project is being implemented. Project documents were consulted, from which some themes were drawn and hypotheses made, facilitating the slight adjustment of the guiding questionnaire for use in discussions with project beneficiaries, as well as providing support to the development of the evaluation matrix of proxy indicators used by the consultant. The interviews served to triangulate data harvested from the reports, and support the development of conclusions around hypotheses, or reconstruct hypotheses and result in recommendation as appropriate.

During the desk review stage, the consultant reviewed a number of project-specific documents, including field monitoring and progress reports. Documents from other on-going and recently closed projects in DPRK were also consulted to better understand synergies and efficiencies in project implementation.

During the interview/discussion stage, the consultant employed an open interview technique, using the questionnaire to guide the, complemented by questions which relate to community development and resilience the humanitarian impacts of energy access at the community level. Despite limitations to the field visits (see below in section on Challenges to the MTR), these techniques, combined with direct observation of the communities visited, provided a fairly clear picture of the context in which the projects are operating, the overall progress of the project against its objectives, the apparent impacts and their likely sustainability, as well as potential longer-term impacts of the project as results are better consolidated.

Analysis of the information, including review of supplementary documentation requested by the consultant during the country visit, provided an opportunity to review evidence gathered against proxy indicators in a more methodological fashion, resulting in a number of findings with corresponding actionable recommendations, keeping in mind the programmatic and operational limitations in which UNDP implements projects in DPRK.

Challenges and Limitations to the Review

Data collection. During the desk review process, the difference between the field visit reports and field monitoring reports in terms of both purpose and information inhibited an initial assessment of how much progress against output targets had been made. Links to the quarterly progress reports by the project were are unclear, and it was difficult to ascertain what change was being created on the ground with the implementation of project activities. Significant time was spent with the project manager and M&E Specialist during the MTR country mission to clarify progress on activity implementation, as well as the purpose of various reports, and what they are used for.

Weather conditions limited the number of villages where direct observation of interventions could take place from the planned seven villages to six, although evidence gathered through the six villages visited was more than sufficient.

Another challenge to this MTR was the need to frame the project intervention within the narrow scope of 'humanitarian' work. While globally UNDP is a development organization, it sits on the cusp of humanitarian work and development, particularly in relation to disaster management. Traditionally, what is considered to be 'humanitarian' work is defined by short-term interventions which emerge from quick on-set disasters. However, the decades-long isolation of DPRK has resulted in a number of humanitarian challenges, not least the gap between energy demand and supply, particularly for life-saving public services such as hospitals and clinics. Inadequate energy access can easily result in loss of life, and in particular for vulnerable groups such as children and pregnant women. A project does not need to be immediately life-saving to count as humanitarian, as long as its impacts – whether in the short or long term – lead to a reduction in the loss of life. It is through this lens that SES is being reviewed as a 'humanitarian' intervention.

Finally, it is important to note that this MTR was undertaken simultaneously with the MTR for the CBDRM project. While the benefits of undertaking the MTRs in this way is important to understand the synergies between the projects, as well as to evaluate management efficiencies, in many cases data collection during the country mission was difficult, as respondents in key informant interviews would often switch back and forth in their observations of the projects, and extrapolating information specific to one project or another, or applicable to both, was time consuming and presented a challenge during the analysis phase of this MTR.

UNDP Operational Context in DPRK

Following the reopening of the UNDP DPRK Country Office in 2009, after its closure in 2007, the Country office restarted operations under a more stringent internal control framework (ICF) which limited the discretionary spending of the office and required significant oversight in the form of international M&E Specialist and the requirement for full verification of all materials procured and installed, as well as the participation of an international staff member in all project activities and field monitoring.

Moreover, the office was limited to implementing projects which fall within the parametres of humanitarian or lifesaving work, which is a challenge to UNDP's traditional development-oriented programming. However, given that UNDP sits on the cusp of the humanitarian-development nexus, there were many opportunities for programming which would reinforce or complement the ongoing humanitarian work by other agencies, such as improving aspects of food security, energy access and disaster management.

Nonetheless, further challenges emerged in 2016 when it was revealed that the current Country Programme Document (CPD) would not be extended, nor would a new CPD be approved. This has meant that new projects cannot be developed, and changes to ongoing projects need to be approved at regional or headquarters level, which is time consuming and difficult if decision makers are not entirely familiar with the political, socio-economic and logistical challenges of projects implementation in DPRK. This restricts how well the Country Office can adjust ongoing projects to a programmatic perspective in changing situations in the country.

In 2017, banking channels was closed, leading to substantial cash shortages in the office, and nearly all procurement was moved to the China Country Office, incurring extra time and costs in procurement, when it was possible. This situation is still ongoing and puts significant operational pressure on the projects and programme staff.

Finally, DPRK has been under a sanctions regime for many years, and UNDP projects employed a consultant to verify that all goods to be procured are not on the list of goods under sanction, particularly materials that could serve the purpose of 'dual use' for military gains. However, in later half of 2017, additional sanctions were placed on the country by the Security Council, which limited not only international procurement but domestic procurement as well. This has had a significant impact on how the UNDP projects are managed, and the lengthy delay in the procurement of equipment and materials for renewable energy and energy efficiency interventions in the SES project is an important example of the impact that sanctions have on project implementation – incurring extra management costs in terms of time spent in preparing and explaining documents at the project and programme level.

Section 3: Analysis of Findings based on the OECD DAC for Development Evaluations

Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership and the best route towards expected results?

Relevance of the project design. This project is both extremely relevant to the current humanitarian context of DPRK, as well as to the priorities of the government to promote the use of renewable energy technologies, particularly in rural and remote areas which have had their energy access negatively impacted by the numerous extreme weather events, including severe flooding, over the past two decades. While the project initially envisioned targeting households as well as public service infrastructure for renewable energy and energy efficiency interventions, given the wide-ranging need across the country, the project instead opted to focus singularly on interventions in public service delivery and other community-wide options such as micro-hydro and improved biomass management. These interventions would have a wider reach, and avoid choosing one household over another, both being equally in need, because of budget constraints.

It was noted on more than one occasion during the MTR country mission that this project has identified the communities most in need, assessing need over reach, and reinforcing the objective of the SDGs which is to 'leave no one behind.' Government counterparts noted that in many cases, project staff would walk 1-2 km to the site where renewable energy (RE) or energy efficiency (EE) interventions had taken place for monitoring and verification purposes. Often villages this remote would not be covered by development projects due to access issues and concerns about value for money – how many people are impacted for each dollar spent. However, although some sites do not site within the traditional parametres of humanitarian intervention, it is evident that the 15 Ris (local level, below county) selected for intervention, and the public buildings prioritized for support, were appropriately selected by the project and demonstrate a suitable model for roll-out across the country, and internationally as a good practice.

During the project design phase, it was assumed that energy interventions would benefit men more than women as improved livelihoods was a major focus of the project. However, the project has evolved over time to accommodate the shifting geopolitical landscape and a need to implement activities that are more traditionally humanitarian in nature. Therefore, the project has resulted in more impacts for woman and children than initially presumed, which will be important both in terms of longer term humanitarian impacts, but also in terms of SDG monitoring.

Appropriateness of the RRF. The RRF was very well designed, with a clear objective and outputs which build upon each other in order to present a strong chain of results. Activities are clearly defined, although some have been prioritized over others, including public buildings over households and less focus on improved biomass management. An important aspect of the project is that it builds from the SWEDPRA and SRED programmes, focusing only on proven RE and EE technologies that are accepted by the government based on the success of the two previous projects, as well as within the terms of acceptable goods for import within the sanctions regime currently imposed on the country.

However, output indicators measure inputs rather than output results. Being purely quantitative in nature, they do not provide insight or scope for assessment on how the activities have impacted the target

communities, nor do they provide a base from which to evaluate the sustainability of the results. Recommendations related to more results-oriented indicators (and targets) are provided in the recommendations section (below).

Another issue noted during the MTR was the wide difference in the output targets set and the results achieved. In a number of instances, the results far outstripped the target which had been set, which begs the question of whether targets were set low because implementation context was too fluid to predict what could feasibly be achievable, or whether the restructuring of activities to be carried out more efficiently through international consulting partners (RENAC, Novi Sad University) resulted in money saving that could be used to increase the number of people trained, for example. Based on interviews conducted, it is very likely a combination of both factors, which in the end benefits the project in terms of impact as well as long term sustainability of results.

When the project was designed, the sanctions regime currently imposed on the country did not limit the types of materials that needed to be imported in order to implement the RE and EE interventions. As such, barring any significant change in the geopolitical and operational context of the country, the activities planned were achievable in the timeframe envisioned for the project (four years), based on the experiences of SWEDPRA and SRED implementation, as well as the strong capacity of the government partners at national and provincial level to take ownership of the interventions and work closely with UNDP for problem solving. However, from late 2016 significant changes in the operating context (closure of the banking channel, more strict sanctions which also applied to domestic procurement) severely inhibited the capacity of the project to implement activities in a timely manner. While the project team has worked hard to find solutions and plan activities far in advance in order to provide enough time to secure necessary approvals, delays beyond the control of the project have put activity implementation way behind target.

Progress towards results: To what extent have the expected outputs of the project been achieved so far?

Assessment of progress towards targets. This MTR provides an assessment of progress towards *current* output targets based on monitoring data provided and supplementary qualitative information captured during the MTR country mission.

Output	Indicator	Target	Progress	Rating
1 Information about energy resources and feasible RE/EE solutions updated and made accessible to local beneficiaries.	Number of technology feasibility studies (including CBA) conducted for RE and EE	24 studies	24 feasibility studies were completed by the end of 2017, meaning that **this target has been achieved** with a highly satisfactory result. Based on feedback from county level decision makers, the feasibility studies have been very informative and useful in their work, and in particular were appreciated for the introduction of the CBA methodology which they can use independently in the future.	**Achieved**
	Number of energy resource assessment conducted in	8 energy resource assessments	As part of the 'bundling' process, the energy demand and resource assessments were combined into one activity which was much more efficient	**Achieved**

	selected counties		and also more useful for planning and capacity building purposes. Moreover, because of the cost-savings incurred through activity 'bundling,' it was possible to carry out assessment for all 15 Ris. **This target has been achieved, with highly satisfactory results**.	
	Number of rural energy demand assessments conducted in selected counties;	4 rural energy demand assessments		
	Number of energy audits conducted in selected counties.	20 energy audits.	20 energy audits were conducted, and the **target achieved**, in order to proceed with the procurement and installation of RE and EE technologies. Based on the satisfaction of RE and EE users (managers of public buildings), the **audits have had an important impact on the quality of the results of the project**.	**Achieved**
2 Increased technical know-how of county-level personnel for energy planning and sustainable management of local renewable energy resources.	Number of personnel (decision makers and energy experts) trained at county level	100 people	61 people (3 women) have been trained at county level by the end of 2017. With the likely revision of the AWP 2018 to account for RE material procurement delays and refocus on training activities, **the project will very likely meet and probably exceed its target**. Moreover, the feedback on the quality of the training received from both RENAC and Novi Sad University (including county level officials who participated in the study tour to Novi Sad) was positive, indicating that at the very least, knowledge transfer has been successful. Application of knowledge is assessed based on the verification of the installation of RE and EE technologies by the project manager, which was considered overall satisfactory.	**Likely to be achieved**
	Number of counties with prepared energy management plans	3 counties	6 counties prepared energy management plans, which is **double the target originally set by the project**. This is largely due to the 'bundling' of activities, which increased the efficiency of money, time and human resources to have a wider impact for the project. However, while the energy management plans have been prepared, **future monitoring to determine if/how they are being implemented will be necessary to determine the value of this activity**.	**Achieved**

	Number of counties with established institutional framework for implementation of energy management plans	3 counties	6 counties have institutional frameworks for the implementation of the energy management plans. As with the previous target, **twice the number of counties benefitted that was originally planned**, and future monitoring will be necessary to determine if/how the institutional framework envisioned on paper works in practice, and to what result.	**Achieved**
	Area (ha) of sustainably management biomass resources	60 hectares	**No progress on this target** has been made at this point in the project. It is unclear if this is solely due to procurement issues or not. However, it is **unlikely that the project will achieve this target**, or even partially achieve the target, and it is recommended that the project work closely with local stakeholders to manage beneficiary expectations regarding the failure of this activity.	**No progress, unlikely to be achieved**
3 Strengthened supply chains for the delivery of appropriate RE/EE solutions for local communities in rural areas.	Number of local suppliers involved in production and servicing (maintenance, technical support, repair) of EE and RE technologies	8 suppliers	6 suppliers have been involved, specifically local engineers, who have been part of the installation of RE and EE technologies, and will continue to receive training through the project and support the operations and services provided by the NTDCs. **This target has been achieved but is also ongoing, which will consolidate and potentially replicate results to date**.	**Achieved**
	Number of local expert centres established at county level	At least 2 expert centres	Based on the technical input from RENAC and Novi Sad University, replication of the New Technology Dissemination Centres (NTDCs) from two to **six counties** was feasible, tripling the planned target and demonstrates how instrumental project efficiency has been in terms of creating opportunities to roll-out activities to a wider number of counties than originally planned, and thus benefit a larger number of stakeholders. **The NTDCs are currently being set up but not yet operational.** With 17 months remaining in the project, it is **very likely that the target of operationalizing the centres will be achieved**.	**Likely to be achieved**
	Number of technology experts, project	40 experts and 200 mechanics	By the end of 2017, 30 experts, 6 designers and 75 mechanics had been trained. With the high likelihood that	**Likely to be achieved**

	designers and mechanics trained		the project will need to revise the AWP to focus on capacity building activities, the project is **very likely to achieve and probably surpass its target**, with the result of improving technical knowledge at the country level, benefitting the county, NTDC and beneficiaries of the project to date (manager of public buildings which have received RE and EE installations).	
4 Increased energy security and self-reliance of rural population through the implementation of RE/EE solutions for local communities.	Number of successfully implemented RE/EE solutions	Nine (9) different RE and EE technologies implemented and operated under sustainable operational modalities	To date, the project has implemented six RE and EE technologies (Improved ondol system; thermal insulation in building, including double glazed windows and doors; retrofitting foamed cement; EE coal stoves; EE biomass stoves; and solar PV system). At the end of 2017, 170 public buildings in 15 Ri had benefitted from RE and/or EE technologies, with immediate impacts including improved temperature management, 24 hr lighting, 24 hr clinic and hospital (emergency) treatment, improved education facilities (temperature control, electricity use for education purposes), resulting in hospitals being able to operate year round and 24 hours per day, and schools seeing an increase in attendance (particularly among young children) particularly in the winter months. Air quality in all public buildings has improved, as has sanitation with the refurbishments including tile floors which are easier to keep clean. However, due to sanctions and procurement issues, it is **uncertain if the project will meet its target of 9 different technologies**, despite the fact that they have all been proven in previous UNDP projects and pass sanctions requirements. Nonetheless, **despite only partially meeting the quantitative target to date, the qualitative impact of the technologies which have been installed has been immense and has dramatically improved the humanitarian situation in target communities, particularly in terms of health care provision**.	**In progress, likelihood of target being achieved contingent on approval of procurement requests**

	Number of beneficiaries (m/f) directly served by implemented RE/EE solutions in selected counties	24,000 people (12,000 male, 12,000 female);	According to project reports, 24,100 people (13,255 women) in 15 Ris have benefitted from the project. However, because the project has only targeted public buildings, and user data for those buildings is not available, there is no way to calculate even a close approximation of direct beneficiaries. Indirect beneficiaries could possible, but not reliably, be calculated as a % of the total population of the targeted Ris. As such, while **the project has ostensibly achieved its target**, the MTR cannot comment on the validity of the data. Instead, **the evaluator concludes that the project has likely achieved its humanitarian target of improving conditions for the most vulnerable** (children, the sick, pregnant women) as the likely and most frequent users of the public buildings, which is ostensibly more important that population data. It is recommended that the project aim to work with county level stakeholders to improve data collection on the users of public buildings to more accurately reflect direct beneficiaries.	**Achieved**
	Average increase of RE/EE based energy supply per person for heat (kgce) and electricity (kWh)	Heat: +200 kg coal eq/ person/y; Electricity: +100 kWh/person/y	Project reports state that achievements at the end of 2017 were 30 kg coal eq/p/y + 10 kWh/p/y. Given that the RE and EE technologies were on implemented in Q4 2017 and Q1 2018, it is **expected that the energy supply targets per person will be achieved by the end of the project**. More importantly, with the installation of EE technologies, there has been a drastic reduction in the necessary manpower to collect firewood, and in the amount of money required to buy coal, leading to increased labour productivity and savings in building operation budgets.	**Likely to be achieved**
	Annual electricity savings in agriculture (kWh/y)	2,400,000 kWh/y.	With the installation of RE and EE technologies, the project has already resulted in 1,538,647 kWh/y in electricity savings, **exceeding its target** of 800,000 kWh/y. **More explanation on how these savings were calculated is required**, and who the direct beneficiaries (likely) have been.	**Achieved**

Factors influencing project implementation. Aside from the overall geopolitical and operational issues which negatively impact the implementation of the project, the primary factor related to the achievement of the results of the project to date, despite the many challenges faced by the project team, has largely been due to the technical expertise and experience of the project manager. Without detracting from the hard work and capacity of the other project team members, it was noted by project stakeholders at national and local level that the project manager's ability to adjust activity implementation to the ever-changing operational environment, as well as his technical background, benefits the project similar to having a full-time chief technical advisor, and has meant that the quality of the activities implemented to date are far and away the highest experienced by the country in relation to the energy sector (as quoted from the Ministry of Electric Power Industry). Moreover, the project management capacities have allowed for the maximum of activity implementation despite the highly restrictive environment.

The secondary factor ties closely with the first, in that the commitment of national partners, in particular the local consultants recruited by UNDP, has resulted in strong technical support and leadership at the national level, which trickles down to the local level, as well as ownership of the results, including commitment to seeing results such as the New Technology Dissemination Centres (NTDCs) be successful, as well as supporting the rollout of training for provincial and local (engineering) consultants to improve local knowledge and skill and lay the necessary groundwork for the future scale-up of the initiative by the government, when operational conditions are more conducive to such.

These two factors are largely positive, although due to the fact that the major positive influences in the project are because of individuals, questions of continuity of these factors should be raised in the event that either or both individuals cannot continue their involvement in the project. Although UNDP has a strategy in place for project management continuity, contingency plans for scenarios where the technical capacity of the project is reduced, or if national counterparts change, need to be prepared.

The above assessment leads to the conclusion that individual capacity and leadership in both project management and among key project stakeholders is crucial for effective project implementation. However, if these factors are relied upon too heavily, changes in personnel either at project or stakeholder level can lead to a vacuum in leadership (and capacity). This will negatively impact the effectiveness and efficiency of implementation, as well as the longer-term sustainability of results from a government ownership perspective.

Barriers to achieving project outputs. To avoid excessive repetition, as noted above in the context analysis and sections on relevance, the major challenges to implementation resulting in significant delays in RE activities relate to the changing geopolitical situation, including more stringent sanctions (Security Council Resolution 2397 (2017)), the closing of the banking channel and delays in decision making at the UNDP regional and HQ level in relation to procurement and budget issues.

Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Project efficiency. Due to the geopolitical situation and current ICF of the UNDP Country Office, the project is implemented through the Direct Implementation (DIM) modality. With an international project manager, national programme and project staff, and supported by an international Operations Manager and international M&E Specialist (at the programme level), the project has sufficient technical and management capacity to be effectively implemented. It should be noted that cost-savings in project management come from cost-sharing of the costs of the project team with the CBDRM project. Not only

does that improve synergies between the projects where project sites overlap, but also improves operational efficiencies in terms of activity implementation. However, the projects[1] carry the programme costs (senior management, operations staff salaries) as well as office premise costs (operations and maintenance of the office building) has significantly increased the proportion of the project budget utilized for project management beyond what would be considered acceptable even in the most management-intensive environments. For example, with delays in procurement pushing most activities from 2016 to 2017, the proportion of the project management costs in the budget in 2016 was approximately 55%, while in 2017 it was 16-18% (depending on whether the APR or AWP is referenced, respectively). These extra costs are being carried by the project to the detriment of communities that could be benefit from RE and EE interventions which that money should be used for. Thus, while the project is rated very well for its saving in project management (sharing project management team costs between projects), the additional project management costs incurred due to procurement delays (inefficient use of project management team when activities cannot be implemented) mean that project cannot be considered efficient in its budget use.

While the project does not have partnerships for implementation in the traditional sense of the term, the decision by the project manager to bundle activities into fewer contracts with consulting firm RENAC (Germany) and Novi Sad University (Serbia) significantly improved the operational efficiency of the project (in terms of contracting, payments, travel, visas, activity planning), as well as ensured a continuity in soft-interventions as one integrated work plan for linked activities could be carried out by the contractors without interruption (which would have likely been the case if a large number of individual consultants had been contracted to carry out individual activities), and later by national consultants.

It has become standard practice for this evaluator to assess the priorities of the project from quality and value for money perspectives. Often times, donor pressure for value for money in implementation is prioritized over quality in implementation and targeting the most in need (where fewer people benefit but the impact is greater). The SES project presents an interesting case whereby project funds come solely from UNDP core budget so there is no pressure to meet the value for money expectations of external donors, while the employment of a project manager with an engineering background has allowed for the highest level of quality in the implementation of RE and EE interventions due to his hands-on approach and the requirement in the ICF for verifications of the installation of materials by international (as well as national) staff members. Despite delays in implementation due to sanctions and procurement issues, this project is a model for good practice in what it means to leave no one behind.

Finally, in terms of adaptive management by the project, it should be noted that while the project team has contingency plans for adjusting the annual work plans based on delays in procurement and RE installation, the continued delays which unduly impact the ability of the project team to deliver its activities indicate that the project has a high tolerance for uncertainty before changes in the work plan are implemented. It is recommended that the project develop a contingency plan whereby no RE activities can be implemented, refocusing on wider implementation of EE installations and consolidating knowledge gains among engineers and decision makers at the provincial and county level in order to prepare for (eventual) scale-up of the initiative by the government and local counterparts. Such a contingency plan would allow the project to capitalize on both the interest of communities in EE technologies, as well as the ownership of the national and local counterparts by sustaining momentum in activity implementation.

[1] At the time of the MTR, there were four operational projects in the Country Office. However, two projects will close mid-2018, leaving only SES and CBDRM to incur programme costs.

Financial Controls and In-kind Contributions. As noted routinely in this report, the project team has been extremely capable at managing its resources and adjusting planning in order to ensure that the project makes the most efficient use of its time and money in light of the many procurement challenges it faces. There is excellent planning, and in a 'normal' operating context, this would result in excellent financial planning and management. However, the project team is faced with many constraints, not least the issue of the banking channel, which impact how quickly it can access funds. In the view of this MTR, the project team is doing an excellent job within the constraints that it is implementing activities and should not be reviewed against issues beyond its direct control. The project team also makes good use of the in-kind contributions of communities related to structural and works. While it was not possible to assess the in-kind contribution of each community[2], it was evident from the communities which were visited that the structural interventions that are in progress or will be implemented next year (provided procurement requests are approved) would be either impossible or significantly more expensive without community participation to make reasonable initial preparations for structural interventions (i.e.: contributions that would equate to less than 15% of total activity cost).

Monitoring and reporting. The Country Office has a comprehensive monitoring system at project and programme level, with guidelines on the roles and responsibilities of staff at both levels. Moreover, the ICF requires monitoring at both levels to be undertaken by international staff, in particular for verification of any materials procured through the projects. However, while guidelines for monitoring projects are in place, there are no specific tools to support standardized monitoring at the activity and output level. The issue of field visit reports and field monitoring reports was clarified during the country mission and understood by the evaluator to be the equivalent of Back to Office Reports (BTORs). However, because there is no standardized format and reports are not individualized as in other country offices, there is confusion related to purpose, content and follow-up. The Country Office needs to improve the tools used for monitoring, and who uses what tool, to clarify roles and responsibilities in monitoring, as well as monitoring for results.

In particular, the current monitoring system for the project does not encourage evidence-based analysis and reporting, despite the fact that it is obvious that there is more than enough capacity among project staff for this to be undertaken. Specifically, reports routinely conclude that change has been effected because quantitative targets have been achieved. Simply reporting that X number of RE or EE technologies have been installed does not mean people have better access to energy. It only means that it is available. The project team needs to collect evidence that the RE technologies are being used (regularly, and how) and the difference that EE technologies make in the day to day lives of the people accessing the services where these installations have been made. This is largely due to the lack of qualitative indicators in the project, which would add both depth and meaning to the data currently being collected by the project staff. As noted previously, given the technical resources available for M&E (international project manager, international M&E specialist) it will be important for the project to include some qualitative indicators where appropriate and feasible, to better understand the change effected by and likely sustainability of project activities. Recommendations for such are detailed below. However, limitations in data collection, as detailed above in the section on challenges and limitation for the MTR, in in particular in relation to getting data on how many people use the public buildings upgraded with RE and EE technologies, and thus directly benefit from the project, do restrict how much the project team, particularly international staff responsible for M&E, is able to extrapolate from the data they collect as they are limited by local translations and access to a wide range of beneficiaries to support quantitative data. Such is the nature

[2] It is understood by the reviewer that a meeting of national partners to review in-kind contributions for both SES and CBDRM will take place, the information on which will be essential to the final evaluation of this project.

of project implementation in the political environment of the country, and ostensibly beyond the control of the project.

However, it is evident that the project team are systematic in using field monitoring to identify issues and challenges – and any changes in project risks – and preparing detailed follow-up actions which are tracked in the field monitoring reports. Based on the management responses to issues and changes in risks, the project team, supported by the Country Office, rely heavily on field monitoring to ensure that the project is being implemented to the greatest extent possible given the operating environment, and use the information to determine how any changes to the project need to be made and when.

Further, rigourous activity implementation monitoring has allowed for excellent channels of communication between the project team and community stakeholders, and informal communications (if not formal) is very good, based on feedback from community members interviewed. The project strategy of developing county energy management plans has resulted in a highly participatory decision-making process on what types of interventions were needed, where they were needed, and how they would be prioritized and implemented. This process has built trust between the communities and project team and leads to good information sharing when/where feasible in light of the restrictions on data collection mentioned above.

Normally, an MTR would assess how well a project uses monitoring data to communicate results to a wider audience, however, within the context of implementation in DPRK limits what data and information can be used and where. As such, the MTR will not be evaluating this aspect of M&E within the project. However, with the potential implementation of more qualitative monitoring of results at the output level, it is recommended that more effort be put on internal communications of results within the wider UN system in order to support the justification for continued UNDP operations in DPRK, and to provide evidence for the need to ease procurement challenges on UNDP for more effective project implementation.

Stakeholder engagement and partnership management. The lapsing of the CPD in 2016 has meant that the project has been limited in the potential partnerships it could develop to both leverage the results and impacts of the project, as well as improve knowledge transfer, especially among UN agencies such as WHO and UNICEF, to have wider humanitarian impact. Partnerships with the government are limited to information sharing in theory, although in practice there is good coordination with line Ministries, although there is no decision-making authority on the part of government. SES's government partners are coordinated by the NCC. They participate in quarterly project steering committee (PSC) meetings, where progress to date, challenges and plans for the next quarter are presented and discussed, with final decisions taken by the UNDP DRR based on input and advice from project, programme and government stakeholders. The Ministry of Electric Power Industry is a participating line ministry with a long history of involvement in, and commitment to, UNDP projects. This has considerable impact on the capacity and leadership by the government for this project. However, as noted above, because leadership within the Ministry is very much a result of the commitment of particular individuals, UNDP should prepare a contingency plan should there ever be a change in focal point personnel for this project.

All partners interviewed during the MTR country mission, be they UN agencies, county beneficiaries or PSC members, said that they felt the project team was effective at communicating progress and challenges, even if the persistence of challenges around procurement created some friction and feeling of unmet expectations at national and county level.

Sustainability. Given the nature of RE and EE, the benefits of the project to date will be very sustainable in the short term, mostly sustainable in the medium term, and likely sustainable in the long term of county-level technical knowledge and energy planning and management capacities are improved and consolidated over the remainder of the project. EE technologies require minimal future interventions beyond basic maintenance and will provide safer and more temperature-controlled premises for health care and education. RE technologies need technical support when maintenance is required, and counties need to plan for budgeting for replacement parts (for example, Solar PV has a lifetime of 25 years, but the back-up battery has a life of only seven years). Knowledge transfer will be sustainable, particularly with the set-up of the NTDCs, which will provide not only technical support, but could also act as a training centre itself for the future scale-up of the initiatives by the government (when feasible).

In terms of the sustainability of the impacts, given that the project has only target public buildings, most of which serve humanitarian purposes, as long as maintenance of the buildings and technologies is sustained by the counties, the humanitarian burden (particularly in terms of health burdens) will be reduced, with improved health outcomes due to improved access to health facilities and timely treatment. An important aspect of this project is that the set-up of the NTDCs to support RE and EE installation and maintenance at the county-level also serves as an appropriate institution for the handover of responsibilities at the county level, which is a reasonable exit strategy for UNDP in light of the operational uncertainty that the Country Office is currently facing. With NTDCs as part of the energy management institutional framework at the county level, the framework for eventual scale-up of the initiative is already in place. Should international funding for such initiatives become more available in the future, the NTDCs will be well-placed to lead such initiatives, for example with WHO which is interested in supporting more EE interventions in hospitals not targeted by SES. Likewise, should the government desire, it can use the NTDCs to implement its own funds to roll-out RE and EE technologies to a wider selection of public buildings.

However, there are always risks to sustainability, and while SES has put in place a number of processes (training, energy management plans, NTDCs) which would allow the counties to carry on with implementation should the SES project have to close due to operational constraints, there are a few issues which the project should plan for. While financial and socio-economic risks to the project's results are minimal at this stage, the ongoing issue of delayed procurement due to sanctions issues will impact the finalization of RE and EE installations, as well as impact environmental sustainability of RE in that it undermines the ability of the project to support the application of quick-rotation crops for agro-forestry, supporting both renewable energy options and disaster reduction in terms of reducing soil erosion and the risk of landslides. The other issue is sustainability of commitment by the counties if their expectations related to larger RE installations are not met, including for micro-hydro dams and channeling. The project will need to improve its management of beneficiary expectations, and likely identify alternative activities for communities where procurement delays will result in fewer RE installations.

Assessment of Cross-cutting Issues

The focus on capacity building assistance. While the project is precluded from providing technical support directly to the national level, it has been able to provide a rather holistic capacity development approach at the county and local level, with support to the enabling environment (energy management plans), institutional arrangements (NTDCs), and individuals (tools and training on RE and EE technologies). Significant technical capacity building of individuals (both decision makers and engineers) has taken place and while training does not equate to improved skills, the implementation of the study tour to Novi Sad was instrumental in terms of providing examples of how RE and EE works in practice, which, based on

feedback during the MTR country mission, improved both commitment to and leadership of processes to improve energy access in target communities. However, because the project lacks qualitative indicators, it is difficult to assess how much of the knowledge that has been transferred has been retained. Recommendations for data collection related to capacity building are provided below.

Gender and social inclusion. As noted above, during the project design phase, it was presumed that most of the RE and EE interventions would target energy access for livelihoods and would therefore have a smaller impact on women and children than it would have on men. However, with the necessity of ensuring that activities were humanitarian in nature, and the refocus of the project on public buildings such as hospitals, clinics and schools, the project has inadvertently targeted the most vulnerable (children, the sick, pregnant women). Moreover, as noted above, the project has in many cases targeted remote communities, which in other countries would be unlikely to be included in such a project due to value for money and beneficiary reach considerations.

However, the project lacks a specific gender mainstreaming strategy, and does not undertake data collection beyond sex disaggregated date. It is a happy accident that the project has been extensively gender-sensitive and socially-inclusive. Although there is only 17 months remaining in the project, it is recommended that the project improve its methodologies for calculating beneficiaries of RE and EE interventions, and spend some time developing guidelines for the counties on gender mainstreaming in energy management within the social context of DPRK, which can be used in any future roll-out or scale-up of the project. The project team should also learn from this process, particularly how easy it could have been for the most vulnerable to have been excluded from the benefits of the project, thus reducing its humanitarian impact.

Section 4: Lessons Learned

One challenge in identifying lessons learned is to avoid nit-picking over small mistakes or challenges to implementation that have been easily overcome through good project management. Lessons should instead focus on thematic or programmatic issues which can help to improve overall project implementation and sustainability of results, while also providing a guide to good practice – as well as poor practice. Through this framework, lessons for the SES project are divided into what worked, and what could be done better. Normally a section on what did not work (and why) would be included but this MTR found no specific issues to raise for learning at this point. These lessons are for consideration only and are not reflected in the recommendations section below.

What worked. The decision by the project manager to bundle activities into fewer contracts with consulting firm RENAC (Germany) and Novi Sad University (Serbia) significantly improved the operational efficiency of the project (in terms of contracting, payments, travel, visas, activity planning), as well as ensured a continuity in soft-interventions as one integrated work plan for linked activities could be carried out by the contractors without interruption. Not only did this streamline activity implementation, it also allowed for a wider reach of beneficiaries, and the project exceeded nearly all of its soft-intervention targets. In project which rely on external technical expertise, UNDP should consider this as a very good practice for replication internationally.

The SES project is also an excellent case study on the positive short-term impacts that a project can have if it is not hampered by issues of value for money or concerns about how remote or how small a target community is. This project is a model for good practice in what it means to leave no one behind.

What could be done better. While the project has been successful largely due to the commitment, capacity and leadership of the project management and counterparts in the Ministry for Electric Power Industry and State Committee for Science and Technology, if these factors are relied upon too heavily to ensure that the project is successful, changes in personnel either at project or stakeholder level can lead to a vacuum in leadership (and capacity) which can negatively impact the effectiveness and efficiency of implementation, as well as the longer-term sustainability of results from a government ownership perspective. It is important that due consideration be made at the project planning stage on what the critical factors of success will likely be and work to foster those (i.e.: enabling environment, broader leadership) throughout the life of the project.

While the MTR has concluded that the project is largely gender-sensitive and socially-inclusive, it is also the opinion of the evaluator that this is due to luck rather than design due to the need to change the focus of the RE and EE technologies from livelihoods and households to public buildings, based on lessons gathered from the SRED project, to meet humanitarian requirement. The project team (and UNDP) should learn from this process, particularly how easy it could have been for the most vulnerable to have been excluded from the benefits of the project, thus reducing its humanitarian impact.

Section 5: Conclusions and Recommendations

Overall Assessment of the Project

Based on the detailed assessment of the project according the OECD Development Assistance criteria, it is the conclusion of the MTR that the SES project is making uneven progress towards its targets but is nonetheless have considerable humanitarian impacts in the health and education sectors in the communities where activities are being implemented. Users of public services are increasing, reliability of services has improved, and the quality of services has dramatically improved, particularly in terms of services provided by hospitals (emergency treatment, treatments 24 hours per day, temperature-controlled rooms for patients to be treated in). The RE and EE interventions have also eased the financial burden of public services (less money for fuel) and the environmental burden as less wood and coal is being used.

While a snapshot of activity implementation suggests that a number of activity level targets will not be reached due to delays in procurement due to sanctions, at the output level it is the bigger picture change that needs to be assessed.

Moreover, the SES project builds on 10 years of UNDP programming in renewable energy, and benefits from the knowledge, leadership and commitment of line ministries. Whether or not the government is capable of scaling up the RE and EE initiatives beyond the 15 Ris targeted by the project after the project is completed is dependent upon a number of factors, not least financial resources to procure the necessary materials for RE intervention. However, it is evident that knowledge and skills transfer has been successful in as far as the necessary technical skills to install, operate and maintain RE technologies, and to identify and install appropriate EE technologies based on the installation verification process undertaken by the project manager.

Beyond the programmatic results achieved by the project to date, it is important to note the quality of project management. The commitment of the team to see activities implemented to the benefit of target communities was evident both in interviews with the project team, as well as in the feedback and observations of the communities visited during this MTR. While both communities and government partners are frustrated in the lengthy delays in procurement related to RE technologies, there is nonetheless a deep appreciation for what the project team has done to date. Moreover, given the significant operational constraints faced by the project in all aspects of implementation, capacities for adaptive management are well-developed and are one of the main reasons the project is able to move forward, particularly in terms of soft interventions. The bundling of activities for more efficient implementation, resulting in outputs exceeding their targets, is one such example.

The project team, in coordination with senior management and the programme team in the Country Office, constantly monitor the changing environment for implementation, with a clear understanding of how much change the project can tolerate before the project must be adjusted to the new context. For example, procurement plans are prepared in December of the preceding year, but when procurement is delayed, contingency plans are developed, and the project team determines at what point the project must change its course based on the minimum time they need to procure and install materials versus how long it takes to plan and implement capacity building activities.

At the outcome level, the SES project, based on the successes and lessons of the SRED project, has made a significant contribution in targeted communities to fill the gap between energy demand and energy supply, particularly for essential services such as health care and primary education. By implementing RE and EE technologies proven in the SRED project, basic energy demands are not only met but are reliable, serving a life saving role particularly in the health sector. Energy conservation is also taking place in the use of energy resources such as firewood and coal, which has positive environmental and financial impacts. Technologies introduced are simple and easily scaled-up and will have a lasting impact in the communities targeted, with likely roll-out to neighbouring communities in the medium-term as the benefits are better documented and more evident to other actors.

As such the SES project makes a significant contribution to UNDP's long-standing energy access portfolio, building on the achievements and lessons of SWEDPRA and SRED – using proven, locally available technologies which do not place a heavy burden on county stakeholders in terms of operations and maintenance. Moreover, SES is an excellent demonstration of the Country Office's willingness to learn and adapt its project approach based on the results of previous projects – in this case, using the lessons collected from the SRED project to refocus RE and EE installations on public buildings in order to have a wider and more equitable reach among community members.

It therefore goes without saying that the SES project is making a direct contribution to the UN Strategic Framework Outcome 3.2 (Local communities, especially those most vulnerable, have access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy). By targeting public buildings in rural areas, the most vulnerably (the sick, young children) are directly benefitting from improved energy access as well as improved air quality in those buildings due to the reduction in coal and firewood use, and improved energy efficiency.

Overall, the results achieved by the project to date are highly satisfactory and largely sustainable, particularly in terms of the impacts of EE technologies. RE technologies have had a substantial impact in relation to the reliability and quality of health and education service provision but will necessitate the consolidation of technical capacity gains among decision makers and engineers at the county level in order to ensure that any maintenance issues are quickly dealt with, and that replacement materials (i.e.: backup batteries) are planned and budgeted for in a timely manner.

Recommendations to Improve the Sustainability and Impact of Results

Contingency planning for RE activities. In light of the continue delays in procurement approvals for materials for RE installations, it is recommended that the project develop a contingency plan whereby no RE activities can be implemented, refocusing on wider implementation of EE installations and consolidating knowledge gains among engineers and decision makers at the provincial and county level in order to prepare for (eventual) scale-up of the initiative by the government, including supporting such activities as in-country study tours, and bringing together national partners, including NTDCs to discuss and share lessons and areas for intervention. Such a contingency plan would allow the project to capitalize on both the interest of communities in EE technologies, as well as the ownership of the government by sustaining momentum in activity implementation.

Data collection on users of public buildings. In order to better understand the direct humanitarian impact of the project, it is recommended that the project team work closely with county-level stakeholders (i.e.: managers of public buildings and national consultants) to improve their data collection on how many people (disaggregated by sex, age, disability) access services, and the impacts that the RE and EE

improvements have had on particular humanitarian outcomes, particularly health. While it is understood that this may be a difficult undertaking given that access to data is inconsistent, it will nonetheless support qualitative evidence that the project is substantially easing the humanitarian burden that counties face in terms of providing safe and reliable public services such as health care and education.

Improved qualitative data collection at the output level. One of the main challenges encountered during this MTR was assessing the qualitative changes effected by the project when monitoring data was limited to quantitative data at the activity level. Moreover, because the project engages in substantial capacity building of the enabling environment and individual technical capacity, it is critical that the project team monitor results of capacity building at the output level, beyond demonstrating the successful implementation of capacity building activities. Below are suggestions for output indicators, and targets, which aim to allow for the collection of data which can be used to analyse the meaningful change in capacity and quality effected by the project to date. These suggestions aim to identify possible entry points for the project, conscious of data access limitations.

Output 1: Extent to which assessment and audit methodologies are incorporated into the workplans of the NTDCs (Target: Assessment and audit methodologies are formally adopted by NTDCs)

Output 2: Extent to which County Energy Management Plans receive budgetary support for implementation from the country government (Target: County Energy Management Plans receive at least 75% of necessary funding)

Output 3: Extent to which NTDCs are operational (Target: plans and budgets for 3 NTDCs approved); % of training recipients also serving as peer-to-peer trainers or providing training in other counties (Target: at least 10% of training recipients engaging in knowledge transfer related to RE and EE technologies in some form).

Output 4: % reduction in coal and firewood use for heating by targeted public buildings (Target: at least at 60% reduction in coal and firewood use); % change in patients receiving emergency medical care in targeted hospitals and clinics (Target: at least a 40% increase in emergency/urgent care treatment); % change in absences among 5-7-year-old children in target kindergartens between November-March (Target: at least a 50% reduction in absences).

Standardized monitoring tools. Based on documents reviewed and discussions with project and programme staff, it is evident that although there are comprehensive guidelines for project and programme monitoring in the Country Office, the lack of appropriate tools for data collection and analysis severely impacts what type of data is being collected and by whom. It is recommended that instead of having joint reports following field visits, whether or implementation and monitoring purposes, team members should submit individual BTORs, with project and programme aspects kept separate. A standardized quarterly monitoring report should be used to consolidate data from the BTORs on a quarterly basis only, providing ease in data analysis. Other country offices in the Asia-Pacific region have implemented a similar tool, an example of which is attached as Annex 10. The report should be completed by the project team (lead by the Project Manager), with quality assurance of the data and analysis undertaken by M&E Specialist. This process would improve the storage and analysis of information, both at activity level, and at output level, where analysis to date is weak. This also provides a clear delineation between the role of the project and programme in monitoring and reporting at the project level.

Communication of project results. Political issues surrounding the relevance of the project in terms of its humanitarian role have created challenges in terms of how to communicate the results of the project. If results are communicated at the activity level through purely quantitative data, it is difficult to understand the longer-term, life-saving impact that the project has and will have. With the inclusion of more qualitative indicators at the output level, it is hoped that more meaningful analysis of the humanitarian importance of the project will be captured, and it is recommended that the UNDP Country Office put significantly more effort into communicating these results within the wider UN system in order to reinforce why UNDP's presence in DPRK is essential, as well as providing evidence for the need to ease some procurement restrictions on UNDP for more effective project implementation and the easing of the humanitarian burden on other agencies.

Exit Strategy. The project has already instituted activities that will support the sustainability and possible scale-up of results once the project is closed. It is recommended that the project team prepare a strategy for the formal handover of tools and information that would be useful for future roll-out/scale-up to the six NTDCs which it is supporting.

Going Forward: Programming Scenarios

Office closure. In the case where decisions are taken by UNDP HQ to close the DPRK Country Office due to the reasons that are geopolitical or lack of financial resources available within the country for continued operation of office as there is no existing banking channel or any internal legal reasons, it is advised that the project team must have a contingency plan ready similar to that of above recommendation on exit strategy, whereby knowledge products and tools for RE and EE planning and management to improve energy access (for the most vulnerable) can be easily transferred to the NTDCs (and a relevant UN agency such as WHO and UNICEF), in order to ensure that a) the knowledge products are not lost, and b) UN agencies are able to use the materials in their own work to support the possible roll-out of the SES model in the humanitarian sectors in which they work.

Complete projects. Similar approach as with office closure, but with a more formal handover of materials to a nominated UN agency(ies), as well as identifying a focal agency to continue support to participating counties and NTDCs for improved humanitarian outcomes.

Small scale up. Should UNDP decide to develop a new CPD for the country office, a second phase of the SES project would be appropriate, replicating the original model in new target communities (potentially 5-10 communities based on the availability of funds), and scaling-up the intervention to improve energy access in public buildings and support RE activities in relation to land/slope management in the original 15 communities. If the opportunity is presented, the project should aim to target the NTDCs with regularized knowledge transfer and leadership capacities.

Large scale up. Although highly unlikely, in an ideal situation, large scale-up of the SES project based on a new CPD would require formalized partnerships with other UN agencies and concerned ministries and departments at the national level engaged in health, education and food security outcomes, targeting communities where those agencies currently work in order to supplement their work with improved energy access and safer environments (i.e.: temperature controlled buildings, improved air quality), as well as improve coordination with the CBDRM project so that energy access targets installations critical in DRR and disaster recovery. Large scale-up would necessitate a greater focus on the monitoring the health-related impacts on the users of public buildings (in particularly clinics, hospitals and schools) than on the

number of type of RE and EE installations made. In this scenario, it is assumed that sanctions were lifted. Further, it assumes that UNDP makes significant changes to its existing country specific ICF that has limitations on the procurement.

Annexes

1. Table of Urgent Points of Action and Recommendations

No.	Issue/Point of Action	Recommendation	Suggested Responsible Party/Time Frame
1	Contingency planning for RE activities	In light of the continue delays in procurement approvals for materials for RE installations, it is recommended that the project develop a contingency plan whereby no RE activities can be implemented, refocusing on wider implementation of EE installations and consolidating knowledge gains among engineers and decision makers at the provincial and county level in order to prepare for (eventual) scale-up of the initiative by the government	Project Manager Immediate
2	Data collection on users of public buildings	it is recommended that the project team work closely with county-level stakeholders (ie: managers of public buildings and national consultants) to improve their data collection on how many people (disaggregated by sex, age, disability) access services, and the impacts that the RE and EE improvements have had on particular humanitarian outcomes, particularly health	Project Manager, Programme Analyst Q4 2018
3	Improved qualitative data collection at the output level	it is critical that the project team monitor results of capacity building at the output level, beyond demonstrating the successful implementation of capacity building activities. Below are suggestions for output indicators, and targets, which aim to allow for the collection of data which can be used to analyse the meaningful change in capacity and quality effected by the project to date. These suggestions aim to identify possible entry points for the project, conscious of data access limitations. Output 1: Extent to which assessment and audit methodologies are incorporated into the workplans of the NTDCs (Target: Assessment and audit methodologies are formally adopted by NTDCs) Output 2: Extent to which County Energy Management Plans receive budgetary support for implementation from the country government (Target: County Energy Management Plans receive at least 75% of necessary funding) Output 3: Extent to which NTDCs are operational (Target: plans and budgets for 3 NTDCs approved); % of training recipients also serving as peer-to-peer trainers or providing training in other counties (Target: at least 10% of training recipients engaging in	Project Manager Q4 2018

		knowledge transfer related to RE and EE technologies in some form). Output 4: % reduction in coal and firewood use for heating by targeted public buildings (Target: at least at 60% reduction in coal and firewood use); % change in patients receiving emergency medical care in targeted hospitals and clinics (Target: at least a 40% increase in emergency/urgent care treatment); % change in absences among 5-7-year-old children in target kindergartens between November-March (Target: at least a 50% reduction in absences).	
4	Standardized monitoring tools	It is recommended that instead of having joint reports following field visits, whether or implementation and monitoring purposes, team members should submit individual BTORs, with project and programme aspects kept separate. A standardized quarterly monitoring report should be used to consolidate data from the BTORs on a quarterly basis only, providing ease in data analysis.	Project Manager, M&E Specialist Q4 2018
5	Communication of project results	With the inclusion of more qualitative indicators at the output level, it is hoped that more meaningful analysis of the humanitarian importance of the project will be captured, and it is recommended that the UNDP Country Office put significantly more effort into communicating these results within the wider UN system in order to reinforce why UNDP's presence in DPRK is essential	Project Manager, M&E Specialist 2019
6	Exit Strategy	It is recommended that the project team prepare a strategy for the formal handover of tools and information that would be useful for future roll-out/scale-up to the six NTDCs which it is supporting.	Project Manager, DRR 2019

2. Glossary and Acronyms

APR	Annual Performance Report
AWP	Annual Work Plan
BTOR	Back-to-Office Report
CBDRM	Community-based Disaster Risk Management Project
CPD	Country Programme Document (of UNDP)
DIM	Direct Implementation Modality
DPRK	Democratic People's Republic of Korea
DRR	(UNDP) Deputy Resident Representative
GMS	General Management Services
ICF	Internal Control Framework
MTR	Mid-Term Review
M&E	monitoring and evaluation
NTDC	New Technology Dissemination Centres
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
PSC	Project Steering Committee
RE/EE	Renewable Energy/Energy Efficiency
Ri	local level
RRF	Results and Resources Framework
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SES	Sustainable Energy Solutions for Rural Livelihoods in DPRK Project
SRED	Sustainable Rural Energy Development Programme
SWEDPRA	Small Wind Energy Development Programme in Rural Areas
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
WHO	World Health Organization

3. Documents Reviewed

SES Project Document

Project Annual Work Plans (AWPs) 2016, 2017, 2018 (and revisions)

Project Quarterly Progress Reports (Q4 2016, Q1-3 2017)

Annual Progress Reports (2016, 2017)

Field Visit Reports, 2016, 2017, 2018

Field Monitoring Reports 2016, 2017, 2018

Project Steering Committee Meeting Presentations (1-10)

Detailed List of Procurement – 14 June 2018 version

4. Sites Visited, Interviews Conducted

(Conducted during the MTR Country Mission 18-30 June 2018)

a. Sites Visited

Unsan County, North Pyongan Province

Specific sites in Oup: Unsan Women's Hospital; County People's Hospital; andCounty New Tech Dissemination Office (under construction)

Specific sites in Jwa Ri: Ri 10 days Kindergarten; and Ri Clinic

Hoechang County, South Pyongan Province

Specific sites in Oup: Training Center for Trainers (refreshing course); Senior Middle School; and Kuchang 10 days Kindergarten

Specific sites in Tokryon Ri: Ri 10 days Kindergarten; Ri Clinic; and Ri New Technology Dissemination Office

Yangdok County, South Pyongan Province

Specific sites in Ryongam Ri: Site for small hydro power plant to be installed

Specific sites in Sagi Ri: Site for small hydro power plant to be installed

b. Beneficiaries Interviewed

Unsan County

Mr. Ri Yong Chol, Deputy Chairman, of Unsan County People's Committee
Ms. Kim Yong Hui, Director, Unsan Women's Hospital
Mr. Yun Jong Du, Director, Unsan County People's Hospital
Mr. Choe Gyu Nam, Chairman, Unsan County New-Tech Dissemination Office
Mr. Ri Dong Ho, Deputy Chairman of Jwa Ri Cooperative Farm Management Board
Mr. Ryang Kuk Won, Director, Jwa Ri Clinic
Ms. Jong Ok Sim, Director, Jwa Ri 10 days Kindergarten

Hoechang County

Mr. Hong Chang Ho, Director, Dept. of Culture, Hoechang County People's Committee
Ms. Ri Pok Sun, Director, Kuchang 10 days Kindergarten
Mr. Cha Yong Ho, Director, Hoechang Training Center for Trainers
Mr. Kim Sang Chol, Director, Hoechang Senior Middle School
Mr. Kim Song Jin, Chairman of Tokryon Ri Cooperative Farm Management Board

Yangdok County

Mr. Kim Hyok Chol, Director, Dept. of External Affairs, Yangdok County People's Committee
Mr. Kim Chang Gil, Chairman of Ryongam Ri Cooperative Farm Management Board
Ms. Hong Jong Sil, Chairwoman of Sagi Ri Cooperative Farm Management Board
Mr. Jon Song Hyon, Farmer of Sagi Ri Cooperative Farm
Mr. Kim Kwang Chol, Chairman of Chuma Ri Cooperative Farm Management Board
Mr. Ri Jong Chol, Farmer of Chuma Ri Cooperative Farm

SES National Consultants

Mr. Choe Song Chol, Section Chief, Dept. of International Cooperation on Science, SAOS
Mr. Choe In Su, Section Chief, Pyongyang Power Design Institute, MEPI
Mr. Pak Chol Nam, Section Chief, Central Electric Power Design Institute, MEPI

c. Stakeholders Interviewed

Ms. Hong Jong Hui, Deputy Director, Dept. of External Affairs, Ministry of Electric Power Industry (MEPI)
Mr. Choe In Su, Section Chief, Pyongyang Power Design Institute, MEPI (National Consultant under SES)
Mr. Kim Ul Song, Director, Dept. of International Cooperation on Science, State Academy of Sciences (SAOS)
Mr. Choe Song Chol, Section Chief, Dept. of International Cooperation on Science, SAOS (National Consultant under SES)
Mr. Pae Yong Hyon, Section Chief, Dept. of International Cooperation on Science and Technology, State Committee of Science and Technology (SCOST)

d. Partners Interviewed

Dr Pushpa Ranjan Wijesinghe, Medical Officer CDS, WHO
Mr Kencho Namgyal, WASH Specialist, UNICEF
Mr Bir Mandal, Deputy Representative, FAO
Mr Robert Dekker, Head of Programme, WFP

e. UNDP Staff Interviewed

Mr. Tapan Mishra, Resident Representative
Mr. Stephen Kinloch-Pichat, (then) Deputy Resident Representative
Mr. Butchaiah Gadde, Project Manager
Mr. Choe Sung Chol, Programme Officer
Mr. Hyok Chol Ri, National Technical Coordinator
Mr. Hua Yu, Project Manager for SED and SERCARB
Ms. Le Le Lan, M&E Specialist

5. Final Questionnaire

Meeting with NCC
Does the project fit with national priorities?
In your opinion, what is the primary factor that has influenced how the project is being implemented?
In the case of negative influencing factors, in your opinion, what could be done to mitigate them in the future?
Do you feel that project has the appropriate management arrangements in place?
Do you feel that the project manages risk well?
In your opinion, how well does the project adapt to changes in operating context?
What would you recommend to improve project capacity to adapt to change?
What do you feel is more important in the project: value for money or quality of results?
Do you feel that the project is targeting the most appropriate beneficiaries?
Does the project communicate its results well?
Is the project able to communicate its results across sectors?
Does the project engage non-project partners to improve efficiency in implementation and overcome challenges?
In your opinion, what has been the most important result of the project to date? Why?
Do you feel the project has an appropriate strategy to potentially scale-up the project?
Do you feel that UNDP has an appropriate exit strategy in place for the project if the operating context changes?
Do you feel the government would be in a position to take over the interventions if the UNDP had to close the project? Please explain.

Meeting with Government Stakeholders
Does the project continue to align with national priorities?
What is the level of satisfaction (1 low, 5 high) with how the project is being implemented?
What is the level of satisfaction (1 low, 5 high) with the results of the project to date?
Do you feel that the project is using resources efficiently?
Do you feel that the government and beneficiaries are appropriately consulted (1 poorly consulted, 5 properly consulted) at all stages of project implementation?
Do you feel that the project staff are able to effectively respond to the challenges within and affecting (1 not at all, 5 effective response) the project?
Do you feel that the results of the project will be sustainable in the 1) short term, 2) medium term and 3) long term?
Do you believe that the project activities will have any negative impacts?
Do you feel that UNDP is providing sufficient opportunities for the government to take ownership of the project and eventual results?
What would you like to change about the project?
Do you have any other information/observations you would like to add?

Beneficiary Meetings: CPC, Factory Managers, Energy Committees
How useful have the energy demand and resource assessments been (1 not at all, 5 very)? Please explain.
How useful have the energy audits been (1 not at all, 5 very)? Please explain.
How useful have the feasibility studies been (1 not at all, 5 very)? Please explain.
What was the main benefit of the study tour to Serbia?

How useful has the training on energy management and planning been (1 not at all, 5 very)? Please explain.
Did you feel that the training manual provided all of the information you needed? What would you change in the manual?
Did the training provide information on how to plan for the specific needs of men, women and children?
What has been the benefit of having a standard methodology for energy planning?
Do you think that you will be able to implement the energy management plans? Do you have enough people/money/technical knowledge/operational capacity/materials to implement the plan?
What is your opinion on the proposed ideas to improve energy efficiency? Which intervention (foamed cement, improved cooking, floor heating, etc) has had the biggest impact in your opinion? How?
What is your opinion of the local expert centres (New Technology Dissemination Centres)?

Beneficiary Meetings: Service Managers, Cooperative Farm Managers
What has been the biggest impact of the new energy technologies in your day to day work?
How has this benefitted the wider community of service users?
Do you think that the renewable energy technologies benefit members of the community equally? Please explain.
What has been the biggest impact of the energy efficiency interventions?
Do you think that the wider community will readily accept new technologies for energy use? Please explain.
Do you think that the wider community will understand the behavioural changes required to improve energy efficiency in both consumption and production? Please explain.
What do you think will be necessary to ensure the wider community accepts the need for new energy technologies (especially for cooking and heating) and more efficient use of energy?

6. Analytical Framework with Proxy Indicators

Evaluation Topic	Proxy Indicators Used
Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?	
Relevance of Project Design	Does the project align with national priorities
	Were target areas selected to fit the project strategy or to
	How does the strategy fit the different needs of men, women and children?
Appropriateness of RRF	Are activities and outputs consisted with the overall objective of the project?
	Is there a direct link between activities and outputs?
	Do output indicators measure inputs or results contributing to the project goal?
	Are targets for the outputs appropriate for the context?
	Related to activities and capacity level, was the project timeframe (including each result) reasonable to achieve the outputs and outcomes
Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outputs and outcome of the project been achieved thus far?	
What are the primary factors contributing to progress to date?	What has been the primary factor influencing how the project has been implemented?
	What has been the secondary factor?
	Have these factors been positive or negative?
	What can be done to learn from positive/negative factors?
	What could be done to mitigate against negative factors in the future?
Barriers to achieve project outputs	Challenges encountered which have delayed or slowed project implementation
	Have targets been set as too ambitious/too low?
Project Implementation and Adaptive Management	
Project Efficiency	Management arrangements
	Cost-effectiveness/challenges to planning, implementation and procurement
	How were partnerships used to improve the efficiency of activity implementation?
	What is the ratio of programme management vs output costs? Is technical assistance considered an activity or management cost?
	Project priority: value for money or quality?
	Outputs achieved on time?
	What level of uncertainty in project context is acceptable before project adapts to change?
M&E	Is the monitoring and reporting system appropriate?
	Is the monitoring and reporting system sufficient?
	How is monitoring data used for project management? In terms of adaptive management, is there a balance between the rigour of monitoring data, or the timeliness of it?
	How is monitoring data used for communication?
	How is monitoring data used for knowledge management?
Stakeholder engagement and partnership management	Is there a partnership strategy? If so, is it being implemented and how?
	How effective is communication between various partners?
	How are non-implementing partners involved in the project?
	Are coordination mechanisms used to inform project implementation?
	How involved are other sectoral stakeholders in improving project efficiency and effectiveness?
Sustainability	To what extent are the benefits of the project likely to continue after its completion
	Identify a strategy approach for a gradual handover of project implementation responsibilities from UNDP to government
	Is there potential for government to scale up the intervention using own funds?

	Is there potential for international funds to support the scale-up of the intervention?
	What are the financial risks to sustainability? What level of uncertainty is acceptable to the project?
	What are the socio-economic risks to sustainability?
	What are the institutional/sanctions risk to sustainability? What level of uncertainty is acceptable to the project?
	What are the environmental risks to sustainability?
Cross-cutting	
What is the focus on capacity building assistance?	Does is target institutional arrangements, leadership, knowledge, accountability within the framework of enabling environment, organization and individuals?
	How is capacity being measured by the project?
Has the project ensured that it has delivered an inclusive approach?	Does the project have a gender mainstreaming strategy in line with UNDP gender mainstreaming guidelines?
	Does the project have a budget to support gender mainstreaming activities?
	How are gender mainstreaming tools utilized in project planning, budgeting, implementation, monitoring and reporting?
	Does project monitoring go beyond sex disaggregated data to account for the different views and experiences of men and women?
	How is gender mainstreaming undertaken in relation to the various project interventions: policy and planning support, capacity building and project management?

7. TORs and Consultant CV

Terms of Reference

Mid-term Review of the projects:

"Strengthening the Resilience of Communities through Community-Based Disaster Risk Management" (CBDRM) and

"Sustainable Energy Solutions for Rural Livelihoods in DPRK" (SES)

1. INTRODUCTION

The present Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Midterm Review (MTR), to be undertaken in 2018, of the UNDP TRAC funded projects directly implemented by the UNDP:

1) **Strengthening the Resilience of Communities through Community-Based Disaster Risk Management (CBDRM)** (Award ID: 00091747; Project ID: 00096791) – See Annex G.
2) "**Sustainable Energy Solutions for Rural Livelihoods in DPRK" (SES)** (Award ID: 00090996; Project ID: 00096469) – See Annex H.

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE MTR

The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document, and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project's strategy, its risks to sustainability.

4. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The MTR must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review (APR), project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategy documents in the area of disaster prevention, relief and recovery; risk management, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review).

The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach[3] ensuring close engagement with the UNDP Country Office, Project Team, counterparts (at the County and Ri level), and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.[4] Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to other

[3] For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results, 05 Nov 2013.
[4] For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, Chapter 3, pg. 93.

bilaterals; officials at National Coordination Committee (NCC), key experts and consultants who provided services in the project implementation, members of Project Steering Committee (PSC), academia etc. Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct field missions to any of the CBDRM project sites i.e. 15 Ris in 3 Counties; and SES project sites i.e. 15 Ris (Including 3 Oups and 1 Dong) in 6 Counties.

The final MTR report should describe the full MTR approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review.

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR

The MTR team will assess the following four categories of project progress.

i. Project Strategy

Project design:

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- Review how the project addresses country priorities and United Nations Strategic Framework 2017 to 2021. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country? Review the project results that are being mainstreamed at national level.
- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design.
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Framework/Logframe:

- Undertake a critical analysis of the project's logframe indicators and targets, assess how "SMART" the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
- Are the project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
- Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
- Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART 'development' indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

ii. Progress Towards Results

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

- Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the colour code progress in a "traffic light system" based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as "Not on target to be achieved" (red).

Table. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)

Project Strategy	Indicator[5]	Baseline Level[6]	Midterm Target[7]	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment[8]	Achievement Rating[9]	Justification for Rating
Objective:	Indicator (if applicable):						
Outcome 1:	Indicator 1:						
	Indicator 2:						
Outcome 2:	Indicator 3:						
	Indicator 4:						
	Etc.						
Etc.							

Indicator Assessment Key

Green= Achieved	Yellow= On target to be achieved	Red= Not on target to be achieved

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Management Arrangements:

- Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of execution of the project by UNDP and recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of oversight support provided by the Senior Management at the Country Office, BRH and recommend areas for improvement.

Work Planning:

- Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
- Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?

[5] Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards
[6] Populate with data from the Project Document
[7] If available
[8] Colour code this column only
[9] Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

- Examine the use of the project's results framework/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

Finance and in-kind contribution:

- Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
- Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
- Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
- Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is there a commitment from local communities and beneficiaries? Is their in-kind contribution as assessed properly?

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

- Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Did the project team provided all the necessary information to all stakeholders? Do they involve Ri and County committees in decision making? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive if there is a gap?
- Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Stakeholder Engagement:

- Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
- Participation and country-driven processes: Do local County and Ri level stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
- Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?

Reporting:

- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Steering Committee (PSC).
- Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil UNDP reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated APRs, if applicable?)
- Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

Communications:

- Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
- Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the local beneficiaries.

- For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project's progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits linking SDGs, as well as global environmental benefits.

iv. Sustainability

- Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review (APR) and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.
- In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

Financial risks to sustainability:

- What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the UNDP assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and income generating activities, communities' ownership in operation and maintenance and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

- Are there any social or geopolitical risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including 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 the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long-term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

Institutional Framework including sanctions risks to sustainability:

- Do the legal frameworks, policies and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? What is the impact of CPD on the project? In case if there is no extension of current CPD or no new CPD is in place, what could be a suggested scenario to continue the activities that are successful and are making a difference in peoples' lives on humanitarian grounds? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.
- What are the impact of Sanctions and suggested approach to mitigate the future risks in delivering the humanitarian assistance by the project? This includes the approach to be followed with 1718 committee.

Environmental risks to sustainability:

- Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

Conclusions & Recommendations

The MTR team will include a section of the report setting out the MTR's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.[10]

[10] Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report's executive summary.

The MTR team should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

Ratings

The MTR team will include its ratings of the project's results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in a *MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the MTR report. See Annex E for ratings scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for Project X

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
Project Strategy	N/A	
Progress Towards Results	Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Sustainability	(rate 4 pt. scale)	

6. MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

The total duration of the MTR shall not exceed a total of 30 days, starting 28th March 2018, and shall be completed within three months from when the consultant(s) is(are) hired.

#	Deliverable	Description	Duration	Timing	Responsibilities
1	**MTR Inception Report**	MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	7 Days	No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission	MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management
2	**In-country mission concluded by a Presentation**	Initial Findings	13 Days	End of MTR mission	MTR Team presents to project management and

					the Commissioning Unit
3	**Draft Final Report**	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	7 Days	Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by DRR, MES, Project Manager, PA
4	**Final Report***	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	3 Days	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to the Commissioning Unit

*The final MTR report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

7. MTR ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is UNDP DPRK Country Office.

The commissioning unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the MTR team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

8. TEAM COMPOSITION

One independent consultant will conduct the MTR supported by National Technical Coordinator (NTC). The consultant cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

The selection of consultant will be aimed at maximizing the overall qualities in the following areas:

- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies (10%);
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios (10%);
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to disaster risk management, and climate change mitigation (5%);
- Experience working with the UNDP evaluations (10%);
- Experience working in South East Asia (5%);
- Good understanding about delivering humanitarian assistance under sanctions, and its impact (10%);
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and disaster risk management & community based approaches; energy access; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis (2%).
- Excellent communication skills (5%);
- Demonstrable analytical skills (4%);

- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset (4%);
- A Master's degree in disaster risk management or Engineering or Management or other closely related fields (5%).

9. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

10% of payment upon approval of the final MTR Inception Report
40% upon submission of the draft MTR report
50% upon finalization of the MTR report

Denika Blacklock (Karim)

Phone: +66948125777 (Thailand)

Email: djbkarim@gmail.com

Nationality: Canadian

Professional Skills

Development professional focusing on results-based strategic planning/theory of change development, monitoring and evaluation and with extensive experience in the Asia and Pacific regions.

Specialization in applying methodologies for capturing change in 'soft' areas, such as policy dialogue/change, participatory development and capacity building. Sectoral specialization in (local) governance, gender, conflict, environment, climate resilience and food security. Cross-cutting areas of expertize include capacity development, policy and conflict analysis, vulnerability analysis and risk management.

Numerous monitoring frameworks designed, monitoring and evaluation tools and trainings designed and implemented, including developing programme and project theory of change, training and advisory/mentoring services provided. Evaluation focus on results and knowledge management. Strategic planning work has focused on position papers, developing theories of change and knowledge products for organizational or programme positioning.

Experience working with a range of institutions, including UNDP, ILO, WFP, the Commonwealth Forum, American Bar Association and Asia Foundation. Recent work has taken place in Asia and the Pacific, including multi-country programming in the Pacific. Extensive networks within UN organizations, NGOs and governments across both regions.

Significant writing and advocacy work as the facilitator of the learning and advocacy initiative 'Pacific Risk Management and Resilience' (www.facebook.com/PacificSDGAdvocacy), focusing on volunteerism and community empowerment to increase resilience in the face of climate change and disaster. Lead contributor to "Theory in Practice" (www.theory-in-practice.net) assessing the gaps between development theory and practical implementation through case studies and commentary.

Professional Experience

Evaluation and Lessons Learned

- **Team Leader, Mid Term Evaluation of the Clearing for Results Phase III Programme: Mine Action for Human Development** (UNDP Cambodia, Phnom Penh, December 2017-January 2018)
- **Editor, Lessons Learned in Climate Public Expenditure Reviews** (*UNDP Asia-Pacific Regional Bureau, Bangkok, May-June 2015*)
- **Lessons Learned in Disaster Risk Reduction in Aceh, Indonesia** (*UNDP Indonesia, Banda Aceh, April-May 2012*)
- **Report on Best Practices from the Papua Development Programme** (*UNDP Indonesia; Jakarta, December 2011*)
- **Revision of Outcome Evaluation – Crisis Prevention and Recovery Programme 2006-2010** (*UNDP Indonesia; November 2011*)
- **Outcome Evaluation - Environment Programme 2006-2010** (*UNDP Indonesia; Jakarta, July 2011*)
- **Final Evaluation - Post-Conflict Fund** (*World Bank Indonesia; Jakarta, June 2011*)
- **Mid-Term Review - Nias Islands Transition Project** *(UNDP Indonesia; Nias/Jakarta, May 2011*)

<u>Monitoring and Evaluation - Framework Design, Capacity Building, Advisory Support</u>

- **Team Leader, M&E Framework and Inclusion Action Plan Development** (UNDP/UNCDF Laos, April-May 2018)
- **M&E Specialist – Monitoring and Evaluation Plan Design, Integrated Flood Management and Resilience Project** (*UNDP-GCF Samoa, January-February 2018*)
- **Consultant – Monitoring and Evaluation Framework Design** (*ILO Thailand, Bangkok, June-September 2016*)
  - Revised the theory of change and designed the monitoring and evaluation framework for the project 'Combatting Forced Labour in the Fishing Sector in Thailand', including providing advisory support on technical issues pertaining to legal sensitivities in monitoring in this sector in Thailand
- **Results-based Monitoring and Evaluation Trainer** (*ARC Innovation, Bangkok Thailand, May 2014*)
  - Designed and implemented a training programme on infrastructure development for Government of Afghanistan, including understanding results, indicator development, target setting, preparing for baseline studies, monitoring implementation plan and accompanying tools
- **Planning, Monitoring and Reporting Advisor** *(UNDP Indonesia, November-December 2013*)
  - Support to planning, monitoring and evaluation activities for governance and poverty reduction programmes, including proposal review, drafting results frameworks, reviewing reports and evaluations from a results-based management perspective
- **Consultant - Monitoring Framework Design and Baseline Study, JURIS Project** *(The Asia Foundation and American Bar Association China Programs, December 2012-January 2013*)
- **Retainer Strategic Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Advisor, Pacific Region** (*Commonwealth Local Government Forum; home based/Fiji, August 2011-December 2014*)
  - Provision of technical support and capacity building for the development of the monitoring and evaluation framework including a Quality Assurance system and mentoring of staff for its implementation; Drafting of the regional and country baseline analysis and reports; Development of a new strategic vision in line with the post-2015 development agenda, including theory of change, a transition plan, capacity building for knowledge management, networking and advocacy.
  - Co-facilitator of the 3rd Pacific Local Government Forum, including facilitation of the Pacific Capital Cities Forum and development of the PCCF Strategic Plan in line with the post-2015 development agenda process
- **Programme Analyst – Planning, Monitoring and Reporting** (*UNDP Indonesia, Jakarta, July 2008 – December 2010*)
  - <u>Development of the monitoring framework and tools</u> for recovery, conflict prevention and disaster risk reduction and governance programmes (annual delivery for the programme USD 30 million for 10 projects ranging in size from USD 400,000 to USD 15 million). Included capacity building (training, mentoring and on-the-job coaching) of all project monitoring officers, project managers and programme officers to implement the framework, including capturing and analyzing project data; developing, managing and analyzing the impact of partnerships; implementing gender mainstreaming action plans; identifying and evaluating risks and risk mitigation plans; and capturing and disseminating lessons learned.
  - <u>Design and oversight</u> of programme and project evaluations.
  - <u>Reporting, quality assurance and donor relations</u> for all programmes and projects.
  - <u>Project development and planning</u>. Consultation and identification of strategic areas of intervention for Crisis Prevention and Recovery and Democratic Governance. Defining strategic approach, partnership

strategies and applying lessons learned and good/innovative practices from previous projects and programmes.

Policy Analysis and Strategic Planning

- **Consultant – Pacific Food Security** (*WFP Asia-Pacific Office, Bangkok, September-December 2016*)
  - Developed the 'Atlas' on food security vulnerabilities and scenarios in the Pacific islands, with a focus on Samoa, Tonga, Fiji, Vanuatu and Solomon Islands, including analysis of income and expenditure data, and food production and consumption trends and coping mechanisms
- **Consultant - Strategic Plan for the Commonwealth Local Government Forum Pacific Programme 2015-2020** (*Commonwealth Local Government Programme, Fiji/Papua New Guinea, May-June 2014*)
- **Consultant - Strategic Planning and Design of Monitoring Framework – Solomon Islands NGO Partnership Agreement/SINPA Program** (*Oxfam Australia Solomon Islands Program, October 2012*)
- **Intern** (*Slovak Institute for International Studies, Bratislava, June 2002-September 2002*)
  - Support to research on trends in racism in Slovakia and Eastern Europe, particularly against the Roma community

Programme Management

- **Interim Program Director, Trafficking in Persons Project** (*American Bar Association Rule of Law Initiative, Solomon Islands, May-September 2012*)
  - Revise the project logframe, identify partnerships with local organizations for activity implementation, organize and manage training implementation, supervise data and information gathering for knowledge product development, work closely with government counterparts to raise awareness on trafficking in persons, initiate awareness campaigns and advocacy to increase knowledge on trafficking among the general public and encourage government to include trafficking in persons within the Family Protection bill under preparation at that time
- **Programme Analyst - Local Governance and Decentralisation** (*UNDP Kosovo, Pristina, April 2006-June 2008*)
  - Programme and project development and implementation.
  - Capacity building/Advisory support to Kosovo Government institutions. Preparation of policy/issue papers, advisory support on work flow management and organizational development, and the design and of a medium-long term Government programme to implement the decentralization component of the Status Proposal for Kosovo.
  - Partnership development and management.
- **Programme Officer - South East Europe and Caucasus** (*European Centre for Minority Issues, Flensburg, Germany, September 2004-April 2006*)
  - Oversight, monitoring and reporting of project implementation.
  - Project management of two multi-country research projects on the Meshketian Turks and developing minority inclusion indicators

Lectures/Presentation

- 'Inter-Religious Riots and the Perpetuation of Ethnic and Religious Conflict in Myanmar,' guest lecture at University of Winchester, UK, 6 December 2017
- 'Accelerated Development: Who Benefits?' At the Pacific Local Government Research Roundtable, Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea, 19 May 2014
- 'Decentralization in the Context of Conflict Prevention and Resolution: Examples from Post-Communist States,' with Ben Lloyd-James, (Territorial Politics in Perspective, Belfast, Northern Ireland, 11-13 January 2006)

Publications

- 'An Arms Embargo on Myanmar Would Not Save the Rohingya,' Al Jazeera, 24 September 2017
- 'The 'Asia-Pacific' Concept is Ridiculous,' in AidLeap, April 2015, www.aidleap.org/2015/04/

- 'Disaster Resilience: Why We're Not Reaching the Most Vulnerable,' in Theory in Practice, April 2015, www.theory-in-practice.net
- 'The 10 Year Cycle: Peace Agreements and Conflict Resolution,' in Theory in Practice, January 2015, www.theory-in-practice.net
- 'Whose Development? The Need for Conflict Sensitive Development in Papua, Indonesia,' Denika Blacklock Karim (Journal of Peacebuilding and Development, October 2012)
- 'The Protection on Minorities in the Wider Europe.' Co-editor with Marc Weller and Katherine Nobbs (Palgrave MacMillan, October 2008)
- 'Securing Implementation of the Ohrid Agreement.' Marija Nasokovska and Denika Blacklock, ECMI Report 58 (March 2006) www.ecmi.de
- 'Finding Durable Solutions for the Meskhetians.' Denika Blacklock, ECMI Report 56 (August 2005) www.ecmi.de

Educational Background and Continuing Education

MA International Conflict Analysis, University of Kent, Canterbury, UK (November 2004)

BA (Honours) Political Science, Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada (June 2002)

Quantitative Research Methods (University of Amsterdam, March 2018)

Qualitative Research Methods (University of Amsterdam, December 2017)

The Age of Sustainable Development (Columbia University, January 2015)

The Changing Global Order (Universiteit Leiden, 17 December 2014)

Risk and Opportunity: Managing Risk for Development (World Bank, 4 August 2014)

Language Skills

English (mother tongue)

French (fluent)

Bahasa Indonesia (working knowledge)

8. Signed UNEG Code of Conduct Form

Evaluators/Consultants:

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 evaluations 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 limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

MTR Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Consultants: ___ Denika Blacklock _____

Name of Consultancy Organization: __ N/A _____

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

Signed at ___ Bangkok, Thailand _____ (place) on ___ 28 May 2018 _____ (date)

Signature: 

9. Signed MTR final report clearance form

Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:

Commissioning Unit:

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP Project Manager

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

10. Quarterly Monitoring Report Template

Quarterly Monitoring Report for <<Programme/Project>>

Reporting Period:

Section 1 – Activities Implemented

Output #	Activity Implemented	Date of Activity	Location of Activity	Budget Used	# Participants		Summary of Activity Results	Problems or Challenges Noted *Record in Issues Log
					M	F		

Section 2 - Output Monitoring

Output	Indicator	Scheduled for Monitoring	Current Data for Indicator	Data Source	Data Gaps Identified
Output 1	1.1				
	1.2				
	1.3				
	1.4				
Output 2	2.1				
	2.2				

	2.3				
Output 3	3.1				
	3.2				
	3.3				
	3.4				

Section 3 – Analysis of Output Results

Output	Analysis of Change Effected based on monitoring data	Issues emerging requiring attention *note in Issues Log below
Output 1		
Output 2		
Output 3		

Section 4 - Good Practices and Lessons Learned

	Detail the Good Practice or Lesson	Date Identified	Recorded by
Good Practice/Lesson (delete as appropriate)			
Good Practice/Lesson			
Good Practice/Lesson			
Good Practice/Lesson			

Section 5 – Updated Issues Log

Issue Identified	Identified by/Date	Response	Resolved (Yes/On-going)

Section 6 – Updated Risks Log

Description	Date Identified	Type	Probability/ Impact	Countermeasure/ Management Response	Owner	Status	Last Update/ By

Section 7 – Approval

Prepared by: Date:	Approved by: Date:	Comment:
Signature:	Signature	