

TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the *Promoting Access to Clean Energy Services in St. Vincent and the Grenadines (PACES)* (PIMS 514)

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Promoting Access to Clean Energy Services in St. Vincent and the Grenadines			
GEF Project ID:	5297		<u>at endorsement</u> <u>(Million US\$)</u>	<u>at completion</u> <u>(Million US\$)</u>
UNDP Project ID:	90426	GEF financing:	1,726,484	1,726,484
Country:	St. Vincent and the Grenadines	IA/EA own:		
Region:	Latin America and the Caribbean	Government:	11,025,000	11,025,000
Focal Area:	Climate Change	Other:	78,600,000	78,600,000
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	Countries are able to reduce the likelihood of conflict and lower the risk of natural disasters, including from climate change	Total co-financing:	89,625,000	89,625,000
Executing Agency:	Energy Unit of the Ministry of National Security	Total Project Cost:	91,351,484	91,351,484
Other Partners involved:		ProDoc Signature (date project began):		December 11, 2014
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: December 31, 2017	Actual: December 31, 2018

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to: *reduce GHG emissions from fossil fuel-based power generation by exploiting the renewable energy resources for electricity generation in St. Vincent and the Grenadines (SVG). To achieve this objective, the Project will promote clean energy decentralized electricity solutions in Saint Vincent and the Grenadines from unused renewable energy resources that may include hydropower, wind, solar and biomass waste. The basic approach of the Project will be to promote renewable energy (RE) in SVG through Project activities aimed at achieving a greater share of RE in its energy mix by (i) the strengthening of the country's clean energy policy framework including the streamlining of processes for RE investment approvals; (ii) increasing the capacities of appropriate institutions and individuals to support clean energy developments in SVG; and (iii) mobilizing investments for RE demonstration projects utilizing solar resources for electricity generation. The lessons learned from the demonstration projects will be utilized to scale-up investments for other on-grid RE projects and RE technologies in SVG as well as other member states of CARICOM.*

More specifically, the project will achieve its objectives through the removal of barriers to the application of RE-based power generation in SVG. This will be done through the following specific Components and Outputs:

Component 1: Establishment of a clean energy enabling policy framework

Output 1.1: Approved framework and assessment of RE resources for long-term energy planning that support RE targets of the 2010 Energy Action Plan.

Output 1.2: Approved and streamlined procedures for RE project development.

Output 1.3: Grid code that will define the requirements for variable renewable energy sources to reduce the risks of power outages resulting from voltage dips and sudden drops in renewable energy inputs

Output 1.4: Institutional arrangements that involve an independent energy regulatory authority to determine fair market electricity tariffs for SVG.

Output 1.5: Energy Unit RE investment facilitation center.

Component 2: Clean energy capacity development.

Output 2.1: RE learning and mentoring programs:

Output 2.2: Dissemination of best practices and lessons learned on the development of RE solutions for SIDS:

Component 3: Clean energy RE-based electricity generation demonstrations:

Output 3.1: Completed specific Project site RE assessments

Output 3.2: Feasibility studies.

Output 3.3: Bankable documents containing business plans and financing options for RE demo projects.

Output 3.4: Support for implementing RE demo projects.

Output 3.5: Replication plans for additional RE projects.

Output 3.6: RE demo investment projects.

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

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

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method¹ for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of

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

relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact, as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (*Annex C*). **The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.**

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to (St. Vincent and the Grenadines), including the following project sites:

1. Solar PV Installation and charging port at the Argyle International Airport
2. Solar PV Installation and Biodigester at the Belle Isle Correctional Facility
3. Solar PV Installation on Mayreau
4. Solar charging port and Electric Vehicle at the Administrative Complex

Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

Ministry of National Security, Air and Sea Port Development

Mr. Godfred Pompey, Permanent Secretary
Elsworth Dacon, Director, Energy Unit
Lance Peters, Deputy Director, Energy Unit

St. Vincent Electricity Services Ltd. (VINLEC)

Thornley Myers, CEO
Technical personnel

Ministry of Transport Works, Urban Development and

Hudson Nedd Permanent Secretary

Sustainable Development Unit, Ministry of Economic Planning, Sustainable Development, Industry, Information & Labour

Janeel Miller-Findlay – GEF Focal Point
Decima Corea – Director of Planning(Ag) & UNDP Focal point

Private Sector

Ricardo Boatswain – Local solar pv installer and also SEI recipient
Fidel Neverson – Local solar pv installer
Ricardo Adams – Site Engineer on the Belle Isle Project
Alston Stoddard – Policy Consultant

UNDP

Ludmilla Diniz, Regional Technical Advisor
Danielle Evanson, Programme Manager
Jason LaCorbiniere, Programme Specialist, a.i.

Project Management Unit

Leshan Monrose, Technical Project Officer
D'Andre Jackson, Administrative Associate

AIA

Hadley Bourne – Chief Executive Officer

Josette Greaves – Electrical Engineer

Belle Isle

Benton Charles – Superintendent of Prisons

Mayreau

Fidel Neverson – Project Manager, RMI

Dr. Vaughn Lewis – Engineering Manager, VINLEC

Thornley Myers – Chief Executive Officer, VINLEC

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

EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see pages 40-42 of the Project Document), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact**. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in [Annex D](#).

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	<i>rating</i>	4. Sustainability	<i>rating</i>
M&E design at entry		Financial resources:	
M&E Plan Implementation		Socio-political:	
Overall quality of M&E		Institutional framework and governance:	
3. Assessment of Outcomes	<i>rating</i>	Environmental :	
Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		5. Impact	<i>rating</i>
2. IA& EA Execution	<i>rating</i>	Environmental Status Improvement	
Quality of UNDP Implementation		Environmental Stress Reduction	
Quality of Execution - Executing Agency		Progress towards stress/status change	
Overall quality of Implementation / Execution			

PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned

and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (mill. US\$)		Private Sector (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Grants			0		1.726		0		1.726	
Loans/Concessions			11.025		0		78.600		89.625	
• In-kind support			1.150						1.150	
• Other			9.875				78.600		88.475	
Totals			11.025		1.726		78.600		91.351	

MAINSTREAMING

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project successfully mainstreamed other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender equality.

IMPACT

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

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions, recommendations and lessons**.

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

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

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

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 18 work days over 4 weeks according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	3 days	October 31 – November 2, 2018
Evaluation Mission	5 days	November 5- 9, 2018
Draft Evaluation Report	7 days	November 10-16, 2018
Final Report	3 days	November 28-30, 2018

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

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

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

TEAM COMPOSITION

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

The Evaluator must present the following qualifications:

- Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s): climate change, energy and related areas.
- Prior experience working in the Caribbean is an asset.

EVALUATOR ETHICS

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

PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

%	Milestone
10%	At submission of Inception Report
40%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to apply as per instructions in the procurement notice. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

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

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Assumptions
<p>Project Objective:³ Reduction in GHG emissions from fossil-fired power generation and fossil fuel consumption for road transport through the exploitation of SVG's renewable energy resources for power generation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cumulative direct and direct post-project CO₂ emission reductions resulting from the RE technical assistance and investments by end-of-project (EOP), ktons CO₂. ▪ % share of RE in the power generation mix of SVG by EOP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 0 ▪ 15.5⁴ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 0.25⁵ ▪ 21⁶ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project final report as well as annual surveys of energy consumption & reductions for each RE project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Economic growth in the country will continue ▪ Government support for RE development and utilization will not change
<p>Outcome 1:⁷ The Energy Unit with the support of VINLEC evolves into a facilitation center to support private sector RE investment development, enable regulators to determine fair flexible tariff structures, bring confidence to private RE investors, and increase the number of approved RE projects</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of on-grid RETs approved based on studies of improved RE policy and tariffs and RE grid integration • Number of RE development project proponents that were assisted by staff from the Energy Unit and VINLEC in the technical design of their projects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 • 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2⁸ • 352⁹ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed studies on RE policy/tariffs, and RE grid integration¹⁰ • Guidebooks on operational rules that assist VINLEC on developing RE power projects in SVG • VINLEC project approvals • Annual reviews of key performance indicators of VINLEC Strategic Plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued government support for legislative and regulatory reform to promote and accelerate RE development • Capacity of government does not substantially delay approval of RE policies and RE projects

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

⁴ Based on figures from Table 2 where 6.2 MW of installed capacity of renewable energy against total installed capacity of 40 MW in 2012

⁵ Over a period of 10 years from RE projects developed during PACES and during the 10-year GEF influence period after the EOP, and with an assumed grid emissions factor of 0.90 tonnes CO_{2eq}/MWh.

⁶ Total RE capacity to be added during PACES includes solar PV installations of 130 kW at the new airport, 100 kW at selected government buildings, 150 kW on private property rooftops (Project will provide TA to implement these installations) and 10 MW for geothermal (Project will provide TA for EIA, removing a regulatory barrier for the geothermal project proponents)

⁷ All outcomes monitored annually in the APR/PIR.

⁸ This will include solar PV rooftop installations and geothermal

⁹ This would include approximately 150 private property owners who have their 1.0 kW solar PV systems installed during the Project, 200 private property owners who install their 1.0 kW systems within 2 years after EOP plus VINLEC and BLPH (for the geothermal project)

¹⁰ These studies are to be completed under GoSVG support with possible funding and support from IRENA and ECERA

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Assumptions
Outcome 2: Raised awareness and increased capacity of government personnel and local entrepreneurs to support the development of RE projects in SVG and by geographic extension, other CARICOM countries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of managers in VINLEC and Energy Unit dedicated to promoting of RE investments Number of technical personnel in VINLEC, Energy Unit and in the private sector who can provide technical oversight on RE project development in SVG and other OECS countries Number of tradespersons who have local certification to construct, assemble, operate and maintain RE technologies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 2¹¹ 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 8 50 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workshop and seminar proceedings RE training course materials Training evaluations by participants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government budgets for RE data collection are replenished on an annual basis
Outcome 3: Renewable energy accounts for an increased share of SVG's power generation mix	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of RE projects that are financed through RE funds where VINLEC has involvement in operationalization by EOP Number of privately-financed RE projects connected to VINLEC electricity grid by EOP MW of RE on-grid projects installed by EOP MW capacity of RE generation projects (on-grid and off-grid) in planning and design stages by EOP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 0 6.2¹² 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2¹³ 151¹⁴ 16.58¹⁵ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Studies of RE assessments and potential Feasibility studies of RE technologies and their deployment at specific sites Bankable documents with business plans and financing options for RE demo projects PPAs and approval permits to construct Contract documents for construction and RE technology installation Work inspection reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sufficient annual replenishment of RE development funds Capacity of government does not substantially delay approval of RE policies and RE projects

¹¹ These personnel are from the Energy Unit

¹² Based on information from Table 2 (pg 12)

¹³ This would include the rooftop solar PV installations for the new airport (130 kW) and selected government buildings (100 kW)

¹⁴ Assumes 10 MW from the Mount Soufriere Geothermal Project, and rooftop solar-PV panels installations at the new airport (130 kW), selected government buildings (100 kW), and 150 private homes (@ 1.0 kW each).

¹⁵ Ibid 43

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Assumptions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> % reduction in electricity drawn from the grid for each household with on-grid rooftop solar-PV panels 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5.20¹⁶ 50¹⁷ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plans for additional RE plants in SVG and in neighboring OECS countries Surveys of electricity consumption after solar-PV rooftop installations 	

¹⁶ Based 200 private property owners that are planning to install 1.0 kW of solar-PV panels on their rooftops, and the planning of a “phase 2” 5 MW geothermal plant to be developed for generation 9 years after EOP.

¹⁷ Assumes a 1.0 kW solar PV installation will generate 32 kWh, with average daily consumption of 18.2 kWh/day (based on electricity demand for Barbados from 2011 MPRA study on "Price Reform and Household Demand for Electricity", pg 11, available on http://mpr.ub.uni-muenchen.de/40934/1/MPRA_paper_40934.pdf) of which conservatively 13.8 kWh/day can be sold back to VINLEC. The household will still need to draw electricity from the grid for the evenings which is assumed to be in the order of 9 kWh/day or 50% of the daily electricity consumption. As such, the indicator is assumed to be a 50% reduction in household electricity drawn from the grid

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

The below list is not exhaustive, but is designed to provide an overview of key documents which the evaluators will need to review in order to address the questions in Annex B.

1. *PIF*
2. *Project Document*
3. *HACT Assessment*
4. *Inception Report*
5. *Letter (s) of Agreement*
6. *CDRs*
7. *FACE Forms*
8. *GEF 5 CC Mitigation Tracking Tool*
9. *Quarterly Narrative Progress Reports*
10. *Financial Audit Reports*
11. *Asset Registry*
12. *Annual Reports (PIRs)*
13. *Site Visit/Field Reports*
14. *Pilot Project Data Reports*
15. *Draft National Energy Policy/Action Plan*
16. *National Electric Mobility Assessment*
17. *Steering Committee Meeting Minutes*

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on the particulars of the project.

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the project relate to the GEF Climate Change focal area and has it been designed to deliver global environmental benefits in line with relevant international climate change objectives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project includes the relevant GEF outcomes, outputs and indicators The project makes explicit links with global climate action goals (e.g. SE4ALL) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document GEF 5 Focal Area Strategies PIF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project aligned to National development objectives, broadly, and to national energy transition priorities specifically? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project design includes explicit links (indicators, outputs, outcomes) that are linked to the national development policy/national energy policy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document National development strategy, energy policy, etc. PIF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project relevant to stated regional development objectives as defined by CARICOM, OECS and other regional frameworks? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explicit links are made within the project to regional development policies, action plans and associated initiatives such as the CARICOM Energy Policy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document National Development Strategy, NES, NEAP, etc. PIF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project's Theory of Change relevant to addressing the development challenge(s) identified? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Theory of Change clearly indicates how project interventions and projected results will contribute to the reduction of the three major barriers to low carbon development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document PIF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project's results framework relevant to the development challenges and are results at the appropriate level? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project results framework adequately measures impact The project indicators are SMART The results framework is comprehensive and demonstrates systematic links to the theory of change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document PIF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the project appropriately aligned with relevant UN system priorities, including thematic objectives at the national/regional and international levels? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project's results framework includes relevant thematic outcomes and indicators from the UNDP Strategic Plan, the UNDAF, UNDP CPD and other relevant corporate objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Document • UNDP CPD, UNDAF, SP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have the relevant stakeholders been adequately identified and have their views, needs and rights been considered during design and implementation? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The stakeholder mapping and associated engagement plan includes all relevant stakeholders and appropriate modalities for engagement. • Planning and implementation have been participatory and inclusive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder mapping/engagement plan report • Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports (PIR) • Stakeholder Consultation Reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Stakeholder Interviews
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have the interventions of the project been adequately considered in the context of other development activities being undertaken in the same or related thematic area? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Partnership framework has been developed that incorporates parallel initiatives, key partners and identifies complementarities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have relevant lessons learned from previous projects informed the design, implementation, risk management and monitoring of the project? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lessons learned are explicitly identified and integrated into all aspects of the Project Document 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Document • PIF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the project achieved its output and outcome level objectives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project has met or exceeded the output and outcome indicator end-of-project targets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports (PIR) • Monitoring Reports • Beneficiary testimony • Site visit/field reports • Pilot Data Analysis/Reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries • Site visits
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were lessons learned captured and integrated into project planning and decision-making? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lessons learned have been captured periodically and/or at project end 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steering Committee Meeting Minutes • Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports (PIR) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How well were risks, assumptions and impact drivers being managed? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clearly defined risk identification, categorization and mitigation strategy (updated risk log in ATLAS) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ATLAS Risk Log • M&E Reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were relevant counterparts from government and civil society involved in project implementation, including as part of the project steering committee? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The steering committee participation included representatives from key institutions, including VINLEC, Energy Unit, Transport, Physical Planning, Private Sector (sustainable finance) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steering Committee Meeting Minutes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the project contributed directly to any changes in legislation or policy in line with the project's objectives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft legislation has been developed or enacted to catalyse the reduction of barriers to the increased penetration of renewable energy/energy efficient technologies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft legislation • Policy Documents • Action/Implementation Plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there evidence that the project outcomes have contributed to better preparations to cope with natural disasters. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project has directly contributed to reductions in one or more vulnerabilities associated with natural disasters 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports (PIR) • Stakeholder/beneficiary testimony 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the project carefully considered the thematic issues related to human rights? In particular, has the project sought to and actively pursued equality of access to clean energy services and opportunities for women and men (i.e. project team composition, gender-related aspects of pollution impacts, stakeholder outreach to women's groups, etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A gender mainstreaming plan has been completed • The project results framework has incorporated gender equality considerations, as relevant. • Multi-dimensional poverty reduction is an explicit objective • The project prioritized the most vulnerable as key beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gender Mainstreaming Plan • Project Document • Stakeholder analysis and engagement plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did the project adjust dynamically to reflect changing national priorities/external evaluations during implementation to ensure it remained relevant? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project demonstrated adaptive management and changes were integrated into project planning and implementation through adjustments to annual work plans, budgets and activities • Changes to AWP/Budget were made based on mid-term or other external evaluation • Any changes to the project's planned activities were approved by the Steering Committee • Any substantive changes (outcome-level changes) approved by the Steering Committee and donor, as required 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Work Plans • Steering Committee Meeting Reports • Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports (PIR) • Stakeholder/beneficiary testimony • Revised Project Results Framework 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent were the Project results delivered with the greatest value for money? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Value for money analyses, requests for information, market surveys and other market intelligence undertaken for key procurements. • Procurement is done on a competitive basis, where relevant. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VFM, RFI, Market Surveys • Procurement Evaluation Documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff and government stakeholders
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was co-financing adequately estimated during project design (sources, type, value, relevance), tracked during implementation and what were the reasons for any differences between expected and realised co-financing? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-financing was realized in keeping with original estimates • Co-financing was tracked continuously throughout the project lifecycle and deviations identified and alternative sources identified • Co-financiers were actively engaged throughout project implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Work Plans • Steering Committee Meeting Reports • Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports (PIR) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was the level of implementation support provided by UNDP adequate and in keeping with the implementation modality and any related agreements (i.e. LOA)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical support to the Executing Agency and project team were timely and of acceptable quality. • Management inputs and processes, including budgeting and procurement, were adequate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LOA (s)/Cooperation Agreement(s) • UNDP project support documents (emails, procurement/recruitment documents) • Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports (PIR) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff, UNDP personnel
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have the capacities of the executing institution(s) and counterparts been properly considered when the project was designed? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An ex-ante analysis was undertaken of the internal control framework and internal capacities of the IP • An ex-ante analysis was undertaken of key partners with explicit responsibilities for implementation of project funds • The cash transfer modality and implementation modality appropriately reflected the findings of any ex-ante analyses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HACT Assessment(s) • Capacity Assessments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the M&E plan been well-formulated, and has it served as an effective tool to support project implementation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The M&E plan has an adequate budget and was adequately funded • The monitoring indicators from the project document were adequate for measuring progress and performance • The logical framework was used during implementation as a management and M&E tool 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Document • M&E Plan • AWP • FACE forms • Quarterly Narrative Reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff and government stakeholders

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compliance with the financial and narrative reporting requirements (timeliness and quality) • Monitoring and reporting has been at both the activity and results levels 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site visit reports 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the project adequately used relevant national systems (procurement, recruitment, payments) for project implementation where possible? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of national systems was in keeping with relevant national requirements and internal control frameworks • Management of financial resources has been in line with accounting best practice • Management of project assets has been in line with accounting best practice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Financial Management Regulations • Procurement/Recruitment reports • FACE forms • CDRs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff and government stakeholders
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The exit strategy includes explicit interventions to ensure financial sustainability of relevant activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Exit Strategy • Risk Log 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The exit strategy identifies relevant socio-political risks and includes explicit interventions to mitigate same 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Exit Strategy • Risk Log 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have key stakeholders identified their interest in project benefits beyond project-end and accepted responsibility for ensuring that project benefits continue to flow? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key stakeholders are assigned specific, agreed roles and responsibilities outlined in the exit strategy • MOU(s) exist for on-going monitoring, maintenance and oversight of phased down or phased over activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Exit Strategy • Risk Log • MOU(s) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there ongoing activities that may pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outcomes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The exit strategy identifies relevant environmental risks and includes explicit interventions to mitigate same 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Exit Strategy • Risk Log 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status? 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there verifiable improvements in ecological status, or reductions in ecological stress, that can be linked directly to project interventions? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project has contributed directly to improved ecological conditions, including through reduced GHG emissions for energy generation and transportation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports (PIR) • Monitoring Reports • Pilot Data Analysis/Reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Site visits

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

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

ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

Evaluators:

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

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form¹⁸

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

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

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

Signed at place on date

Signature: _____

¹⁸www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE¹⁹

- i. Opening page:
 - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
 - UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
 - Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
 - Implementing Partner and other project partners
 - Evaluation team members
 - Acknowledgements
- ii. Executive Summary
 - Project Summary Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Evaluation Rating Table
 - Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
(See: UNDP Editorial Manual²⁰)
1. Introduction
 - Purpose of the evaluation
 - Scope & Methodology
 - Structure of the evaluation report
2. Project description and development context
 - Project start and duration
 - Problems that the project sought to address
 - Immediate and development objectives of the project
 - Baseline Indicators established
 - Main stakeholders
 - Expected Results
3. Findings
(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be rated²¹)
- 3.1 Project Design / Formulation
 - Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
 - Assumptions and Risks
 - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
 - Planned stakeholder participation
 - Replication approach
 - UNDP comparative advantage
 - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
 - Management arrangements
- 3.2 Project Implementation
 - Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
 - Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)

¹⁹The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

²⁰ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

²¹ Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

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

3.3 Project Results

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

4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

5. Annexes

- ToR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

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

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