

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Terminal Evaluation of the Promoting Sustainable Bio-energy Production from Biomass In Timor-Leste

Type of Contract: Individual Contract (Consultant)
Duration: Mid-Dec 2019 – -Feb 2020 (total 22 working days)
Location: Home based (12 days) + Mission to Timor-Leste 10 days

1. INTRODUCTION / BACKGROUND

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) set out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the project titled Promoting Sustainable Bio-energy Production from Biomass in Timor-Leste (PIMS# 4250, Atlas# 00088130).

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
<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf>.

The Project is implemented by UNDP and the *Directorate General for Electricity of Government of Timor-Leste* as the primary government partner. The project *will end in March 2020*.

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project title:	Promoting Sustainable Bio-energy Production from Biomass in Timor-Leste			
GEF Project ID:	4250		at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)
UNDP Project ID:	77146 /88130	GEF financing:	1,743,000	To be completed upon the commencement of the TE
Country:	Timor-Leste	IA/EA own:	620,000	To be completed upon the commencement of the TE
Region:	RBAP	Local Government:	\$1,310,000 in kind and \$4,200,000 cash	To be completed upon the commencement of the TE
Focal Area:	Climate Change	Other:	150,000 (UNDP social Business) \$210,000 (Mercy Corps) \$100,000 (Startec)	To be completed upon the commencement of the TE

			\$60,000 (Haburas, in - kind)	
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	CC-SP 5 Promoting sustainable innovative systems for urban transport	Total co-financing:	5660000	To be completed upon the commencement of the TE
Executing Agency:	UNDP	Total Project Cost:	8,393,000	To be completed upon the commencement of the TE
Other Partners involved:	Secretary of State for Electricity – Directorate General of Electricity	Pro Doc Signature (date project began)	May 2014	Actual implementation started in Jan 2016)
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: May 2018	Actual: 31 March 2020

Project description

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), acting as an implementing agency of the Global Environment Facility (GEF), is providing assistance to the Secretary of State for Electricity, in particular to the National Directorate of Renewable Energy (NDRR), to implement the Promoting Sustainable Bio-energy Production from Biomass (SBEPB) in Timor-Leste project. SBEPB focuses on the promotion and use of biomass energy resources for the provision of energy access and services in rural areas. Overall, the Project is expected to result in a reduction of annual biomass/fuel wood consumption in Timor-Leste through the gradual utilization of biomass-based energy systems and efficiency improvements in the rural areas of the country as influenced by the Project. The Project is to facilitate the widespread application of biomass-based energy systems, particularly for economic and social uses in the country's rural areas. The reduction of GHG emissions through the use of more efficient fuel wood technologies and sustainable biomass energy generation in the country will contribute to global GHG emission reductions.

SBEPB project is a four-year program contributing to the reduction of greenhouse emissions through removal of barriers to sustainable production and utilization of biomass resources in Timor-Leste and application of biomass energy technologies to support local economic, environmental and social development. The project is envisioned to increase Timor-Leste's access to clean bioenergy and also create employment through inclusive businesses.

Based on the above strategic considerations, the Project focuses on three major components:

- Component 1: Policy and Institutional Support for Deployment and Commercialization of Advanced Bio-energy Technologies.
- Component 2: Bio-energy Investments Promotion - Sustainable Bio-energy Technology Demonstration & Market Development
- Component 3: Capacity Development and Market Transformation

2. OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to enhance the capacity of all relevant public and private stakeholders, develop policy and legal bioenergy frameworks for the promotion of energy efficient and low carbon end-use

appliances and scaling up of 20,000 improved cook stoves (ICS) in the country. The project is assisting the Government of Timor-Leste in mainstreaming sustainable biomass energy in policy formulation and consequently helping in mitigating the national emission of greenhouse gases resulting from deforestation and the use of non-renewable biomass.

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.

The scope of the evaluation will cover all activities undertaken in the framework of the project. The evaluator will compare planned outputs of the project to actual outputs and assess the actual results to determine their contribution to the attainment of the project objectives. It will also attempt to evaluate the efficiency of project management, including the delivery of outputs and activities in terms of quality, quantity, timeliness and cost efficiency as well as features related to the process involved in achieving those outputs and the impacts of the project. The evaluation will also address the underlying causes and issues that contributed to targets not adequately achieved.

The consultant is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring engagement with the project team, project partners and all key stakeholders. The consultant should include in the Inception Report a tentative list of all the stakeholders to be met with during the in-country mission as an Annex so that timely support can be provided to arrange those meetings

The consultant is expected to use interviews, focus group discussions, observations at field sites, and any other methodology deemed necessary as a means of collecting data on the performance and success of the project. Questionnaires or any other methodological instruments prepared by the consultant can be distributed to national project partners and beneficiaries, if deemed necessary, facilitated by participating implementing agencies. The international consultant will work with a national consultant who will be guided by the international consultant to carry out various background work, analysis, data collections, translation, facilitation of interviews and focus group discussions and interactions with the beneficiaries, etc.

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**, as defined and explained in the [UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects](#). A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR in [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 senior management and programme teams,, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: Secretary of State for Electricity; Civil Society; Project Board/Steering Committee members; key stakeholders.

The Evaluator is also expected to visit some of the project sites that will be determined after initial review and assessment of the documents and consultations with stakeholders. In case of in-country travel (if required), local travel cost (transportation, hotel, meals, shall be covered by the project as per actuals.

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

Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

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

A useful table to include in the evaluation report (where relevant) is set out below:

Rating Project Performance: Using the following 6-point scale: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	<i>rating</i>	2. IA& EA Execution	<i>rating</i>
M&E design at project start up		Quality of UNDP Implementation	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	
3. Assessment of Outcomes	<i>rating</i>	4. Sustainability (4-point scale: Likely (L), Moderately likely (ML); Moderately Unlikely (MU); Unlikely (U)	<i>rating</i>
Relevance: (relevant (R) or not relevant (NR)-2-point scale		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-economic:	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall Quality of Project Outcome		Environmental :	
		Overall likelihood of risks to sustainability:	
5. Impact: 3-point scale (Significant (S); Minimal (M); Negligible (N)	<i>rating</i>		
Environmental status improvement			
Environmental stress reduction			
Progress towards stress/status change			
Overall Project Results			

Project finance / co-finance

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing

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

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Grants								
Loans/ Concessions								
• In-kind support								
• Other								
Totals								

Mainstreaming

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

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) Implementation of strengthened enabling policies, legal and institutional framework for deployment of biomass energy technologies as well as the growth of biomass energy businesses in Timor-Leste; b) Availability of financial support for rural bio-energy production and associated low-carbon technology applications
c) Increased investments in Bio-energy; d) GHG emissions avoided from technology applications and investments; and e) Enhanced capacities of policy makers, financial institutions, entrepreneurs, project developers, communities and end-users on the development of the local BET market.

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned**. Conclusions should build on findings and backed by evidence. Recommendations should be prioritized, specific, relevant, and targeted, and given that this is a terminal evaluation, recommendations must be useful for future programming and new project development in same or similar areas for UNDP and the Government. Lessons should have wider applicability to other initiatives across the region, the areas of interventions, and for future programming in Timor Leste.

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP Timor Leste Country Office. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluator and ensure provision of payment installments. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluator to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

Although the consultants should feel free to discuss with the authorities concerned, all matters relevant to its assignment, they are not authorized to make any commitment or statement on behalf of UNDP or GEF or the project management.

Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be 22X days between mid-Dec 2019 and February 2020 as shown below :

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation (home based): review of documents and preparation of the Inception Report	4 days	By 23 December 2019
Evaluation Mission to Timor Leste including a debriefing with power point presentation.	10 days	25 January 2020
Draft Evaluation Report (home based)	5 days	3 February 2020
Final Report (home based)	3 days	22 February 2020

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluator is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluator elaborates on the methodology and tools for data collection and consultations, process to be followed and stakeholders to be consulted. Also includes a timeline with milestones.	23 December 2019	Evaluator submits to UNDP Country Office which reviews and provides feedback.
Mission debriefing in Power Point slides	Initial Findings	End of evaluation in-country mission	To project management, UNDP Country Office
Draft Evaluation Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	3 February 2020	Sent to UNDP CO focal point, reviewed by RTA, Programme Unit, GEF OFPs to submit comments and suggestions by mid-Feb 2020
Final Report*	Revised report	22 February 2020	Sent to UNDP CO that will be responsible for further actions.

*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.

The report shall be submitted and all further communication with UNDP regarding the implementation of this assignment should be addressed to:

Ms. Felisberta Moniz da Silva
UNDP Timor Leste Country Office
UN house, Caicoli
Dili, Timor Leste
e-mail: felisberta.dasilva@undp.org

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'](#)

Evaluation Quality:

The Evaluation Quality will be assessed using UNDP's Independent Evaluation Office's Quality Criteria¹.

Responsibility for Expenses and their Reimbursement

The Consultant will be responsible for all personal administrative and travel expenses associated with undertaking this assignment including office accommodation, printing, stationary, telephone and electronic communications, and report copies incurred in this assignment. For this reason, the contract is prepared as a lump sum contract.

The remuneration of work performed will be conducted as follows:

- **First payment:** 10% of the total contract upon submission of the inception report and its acceptance by UNDP Country Office;
- **Second payment:** 40% of the total contract upon submission of the draft Evaluation Report and its acceptance by UNDP Country Office;
- **Third/Final payment:** 50% of the total contract upon submission of the final Evaluation Report and its acceptance by UNDP Country Office.

3. COMPETENCIES

Required competencies:

- Strong interpersonal skills, communication and diplomatic skills,
- Ability to plan and organize his/her work, efficient in meeting commitments, observing deadlines and achieving results
- Openness to change and ability to receive/integrate feedback
- Ability to work under pressure and stressful situations
- Strong analytical, reporting and writing abilities

4. QUALIFICATIONS

The Evaluator **must be independent** from both the policy-making process and the delivery and management of activities in question, i.e. he/she must not have participated in the preparation and/or

¹ <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/PDF/section-6.pdf>

implementation of the assessed project and must not be in a conflict of interest with project-related activities.

Academic Qualifications/Education and work experience:

- At least a Master’s degree in Climate Change, Environmental Management/Engineering/Science, Energy Management, or other closely related field.
- 10 years of experience in programme/project evaluation
- Prior experience in evaluating at least two similar projects in the theme of the project to be evaluated
- Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and climate change mitigation (CCM); experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis;
- Recent knowledge of UNDP’s results-based evaluation policies and procedures;
- Significant experience in evaluation of international donor funded development projects;
- Excellent communication and analytical skills;
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;

Language skills:

- Excellent English writing and communication skills

5. EVALUATION OF APPLICANTS

Submissions to be made by the applicants:

- a) A letter of confirmation expressing interest to undertake the assignment.
- b) A detailed CV of the applicant indicating all experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references;
- c) Technical proposal outlining the methodology, process, and a work plan the applicant will apply to conduct the evaluation, including the tools that will be applied to collect the data, and stakeholders to be consulted.
- d) One example of evaluation report in the area similar to the theme of this project.
- e) Financial proposal specifying a total lump sum amount for the tasks specified in this announcement. The financial proposal shall include a breakdown of this lump sum amount (number of anticipated working days – in home office and on mission, total international travel – any other possible costs), using the following template.

	Total number of days*	Rate per day in USD	Total USD
Home-based work*			
Work on mission*			
Total travel cost for one mission to Timor Leste			
Any other cost			
GRAND TOTAL			

Please note that the **financial proposal is all-inclusive and shall take into account various expenses incurred by the consultant/contractor during the contract period (e.g. fee, health insurance, vaccination and any other relevant expenses related to the performance of services...). All envisaged **travel costs** must*

be included in the financial proposal. This includes all travel to join duty station/repatriation travel, DSAs, visa fees, etc. .

Payments will be based on invoices on achievement of agreed milestones i.e. upon delivery of the services specified in the TOR in a satisfactory manner and certification by the UNDP

*Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have **vaccinations/inoculations** when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director. Consultants are also required to comply with the UN **security directives** set forth under dss.un.org. **General Terms and conditions** as well as other related documents can be found under: <http://on.undp.org/t7fJs>*

Evaluation criteria:

The technical proposal will carry 70% and the financial proposal will carry 30% of the total 100% possible points. The combined score will be applied to determine the final selection.

Technical evaluation criteria:

	Qualification of the applicant:	points
	10 years work experience in programme/project evaluation	5
	Prior experience in evaluation of at least 2 similar projects	10
	Prior experience in conducting GEF-funded project evaluations;	10
	Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and climate change mitigation (CCM); experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis (as assessed from the CV, publications, reports produced, work experience)	10
	Technical proposal	
	The methodology proposed for this evaluation including the tools to be applied	20
	The process proposed to conduct the evaluation and to include the relevant stakeholders	15
	Total	70 points

ANNEXES:

- A: Project Result Framework
- B: List of Documents to be reviewed by the Evaluator
- C: Evaluation Questions
- D: Rating scales
- E: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form
- F: Evaluation Report Outline
- H: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

Annex A: Projects Result Framework

	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline	End of Project Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions
Project Objective To strengthen institutional capacity for effectively managing information systems for national MEA obligations and monitoring impact and progress.	Indicator 1: Number of new partnership mechanisms with funding for sustainable management solutions of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste at national and/or subnational level.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coordination and formal mechanism are inadequate. Further, many solutions for the sustainable management of natural resources are only available within the construct of externally-funded projects. Thus, the baseline of this indicator is effectively zero. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Institutional arrangements and inter-agency agreements on information management are negotiated One new cooperation mechanism targeted to catalyzing Rio Convention mainstreaming at the directorate level among stakeholder agencies and organizations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting Minutes² Working group and workshop reports and products³ UNDP quarterly progress reports Annual Project Implementation Reports Independent final evaluation report GEF Cross-Cutting Capacity Development Scorecard Resource mobilization strategy Training programme 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government ministries and authorities maintain political commitment to the project The project will be executed in a transparent, holistic, adaptive, and collaborative manner Non-state stakeholder representatives, in particular project champions, remain active participants in the project Policy and institutional reforms and modifications recommended by the project are politically, technically, and financially feasible There is a commitment of the relevant government agencies and their
	Indicator 2: Number of countries with legal, policy and institutional frameworks in place for conservation, sustainable use, and access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The baseline of this indicator is qualitatively measured as inadequate, reflected by the inadequacy of existing policy and legal instruments to guarantee the realization of Rio Convention obligations. While the baseline consists of various 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One consultative and coordinating mechanism that catalyzes the mainstreaming of global environmental obligations within national development planning and policy formulation 		

² Meeting minutes includes records of key meetings such as local, regional and national consultations regarding inputs on the design and implementation of the relevant output and associated activities. Meetings may be individual or group meetings, with government officials or non-state stakeholders.

³ These will include a list of all workshop and working group participants

	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline	End of Project Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions
		environmental and development policies and laws, their inadequacy lies in their sectoral and thematic construct, insufficient awareness and understanding of how to reconcile competing policies and laws, and inadequate guidance on the strategic operationalization of this policy framework.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least one by-law or legal instrument has been developed or strengthened to catalyze compliance with standards to support the realization of Rio Convention obligations • At least one sectoral plan effectively integrated with criteria and indicators that reinforce Rio Convention obligations achievements. 		<p>staffs to actively engage in project activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-state stakeholder representatives, in particular project champions, remain active participants in the project
	Indicator 3: Number of direct project beneficiaries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The baseline for this project is set at zero, to be compared with the number of unique stakeholders benefitting from the project's activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 350 different stakeholders have benefitted directly from project activities 		
	Indicator 4: Systems for data and information are strengthened and Rio Convention obligations are mainstreamed into sectoral plans that	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategies, policies and programmes for environmental conservation are inadequate • The existing institutional structures and mechanisms for data and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutional and technical capacities to use data and information for planning and decision-making on cross-cutting global environmental issues 		

	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline	End of Project Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions
	include targets to measure progress toward achieving global environmental obligations	information management are out of date and hinder by limited data sharing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is improved coordination between stakeholder • Obligations under the Rio conventions are mainstreamed into select sectoral policies, legislation, plans and programmes • There is an increase in the appreciation of the Rio Conventions among the general public • Rio Convention obligations are being better implemented through an integrated system of data and information management 		
Component/Outcome ⁴ 1 Enhanced institutional and technical capacities to use data and information for planning and	Indicator 5: A data and information management system is developed and tested that allows data, information, and knowledge to be tracked through	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data creation and management remains a major challenge for Timor-Leste. • Systems for data and information management are outdated and inadequate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Systems and processes for managing key environmental data and information updated by month 12 • Institutional reforms for improved access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting minutes • Feasibility study • Peer reviewer comments • Baseline assessment • Official letter of approval 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Best practices from other countries are appropriately used • Assessment is deemed legitimate, relevant, and valid among all key stakeholder representatives and

⁴Outcomes are short- to medium-term results that the project makes a contribution towards, and that are designed to help achieve the longer term objective. Achievement of outcomes will be influenced both by project outputs and additional factors that may be outside the direct control of the project.

	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline	End of Project Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions
decision-making on cross-cutting global environmental issues	<p>creation to informing policy and plans</p> <p>Indicator 6: Stakeholders are trained on best practice skills to use data and information for planning and decision-making on the global environment</p> <p>Indicator 7: A long-term training programme is developed and institutionalized on Rio Convention mainstreaming based on lessons learned from the project's learning-by-doing workshops and related exercises</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decision-makers and government staff have limited technical skills 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> to data and information implemented by month 31 Environmental indicators are selected and incorporated into M&E processes by month 36 A cost-effective monitoring plan is finalized by month 12 Select monitoring and compliance reforms piloted from month 13 to 36 Institutional arrangements and inter-agency agreements on information sharing are negotiated by month 31 Early implementation of the system is completed by month 36 Institutions and stakeholders trained by month 36 Training exercises begin by month 18 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lessons learned report Needs assessment report Training programme and module Tracking and progress reports Participant registration lists Workshop reports SWOT and gap analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> project champions Expert peer reviewers follow through with quality reviews System is politically, technically, and financially feasible The government remains politically committed to the system and facilitates its development and approval The experience of civil servants and other stakeholders in the learn-by-doing training will be sufficiently rewarding that further interest is generated for sustained and active participation in the long-term Lead agencies will allow their staff to attend all trainings

	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline	End of Project Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions
			<p>and continues through to month 36</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 150 stakeholders (at least 40% women) are trained on data management skills relevant to the NEIS • Long-term training programme on data and information management developed by month 40 		
<p>Component 2 Coordination of technical directorates, policy, planning and programming</p>	<p>Indicator 8: Inter-ministerial and inter-directorate communication, coordination, and collaboration is strengthened</p> <p>Indicator 9: Non-state public consultative mechanisms developed and integrated into official planning and decision-making processes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is limited inter and intra agency coordination • There is a weak legislative base for coordination and information sharing of research activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-state public consultative mechanisms developed by month 38 • National inter-directorate coordination group established by month 5 and convened • Inter-ministerial council meetings convened • Training workshops for improved inter-agency coordination and collaboration held 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Memoranda of agreements • Working group minutes • Attendance list 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-state stakeholder representatives, in particular project champions, remain active participants in the project • Institutional reforms and modifications recommended by the project are politically, technically, and financially feasible

	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline	End of Project Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions
Component 3 Global environmental obligations mainstreamed into select sectoral policies, legislation, plans and programmes	<p>Indicator 10: Operational by-laws are developed to improve and legitimize Rio Convention mainstreaming into sector development plans.</p> <p>Indicator 11: New and improved best practice approaches to reconcile sectoral priorities with Rio Convention obligations are integrated into the decision-making framework</p> <p>Indicator 12: A sustainable financing strategy is developed for the national environmental information system</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategies, policies and programmes for environmental conservation are inadequate • There is limited availability of funding • Existing government and private sector budgets for environmental management are very limited 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targeted policies, legal and regulatory instruments are amended by month 18 • Pilot mainstreaming of Rio Conventions into high priority sectoral development policies, legislation, plans, and/or programme (through learning-by-doing and mentoring processes) • Roadmap prepared to implement global environmental in accordance to the Strategic Development Plan and Environmental Basic Law 26/2012 by month 41 • Feasible resource mobilization strategy finalized by month 39 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resource mobilization strategy • By-laws • Working group meeting minutes • Updated mandates and operational plans • Roadmap 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategy developed by the project is politically, technically, and financially feasible • Institutional reforms and modifications recommended by the project are politically, technically, and financially feasible and approved by the Project Steering Committee • Institutions and working groups are open to change

	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline	End of Project Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions
<p>Component 4</p> <p>Enhanced awareness and value of the global environment to meet socio-economic priorities</p>	<p>Indicator 13: Raised awareness of the contribution of global environmental values to socio-economic development</p> <p>Indicator 14: Education modules on the importance of the global environment developed and English language courses held</p> <p>Indicator 15: Collectively and over the three years of project implementation, the awareness-raising workshops engage over 500 unique stakeholders</p> <p>Indicator 16: A government-based website is created to network existing sources of electronic data and information</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There have been notable observations by stakeholders that low level of awareness among policy makers is a key challenge to promote all environmental issues in TL – particularly for finalizing national policies, plans, strategies and also for allocation of resources in relevant ministries and agencies. • Government stakeholders and the general public remain unaware or unconcerned about the contribution of the Rio Conventions to meeting and satisfying local and national socio-economic priorities • Awareness of Rio Convention mainstreaming is limited, and stakeholders do not fully appreciate the value of conserving the global environment. • During PPG consultations, limited English skills were identified as a major 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public Service Announcement (PSA) • Environmental awareness module prepared • Project Launch and Results Conference held by months 4 and 46 • Private sector and media sensitization panel discussions held • Articles on linkages between the global environment and socio-economic issues • Survey developed (N>500) and employed by month 6 and 46 • At least two (2) national and three (3) sub-national awareness workshops held, spread out in years 2,3,and 4 • At least two (2) private sector and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Panel discussion minutes • Meeting minutes • Awareness and sensitization workshop reports • Training programme, curricula, materials and training modules • Attendance list • PSA • Brochures and articles • Facebook page 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in awareness and understanding of Rio Convention mainstreaming can be attributed to project activities (survey questionnaire can address this issue) • Survey respondents contribute their honest attitudes and values • Survey results will show an increased awareness and understanding of the Rio Conventions’ implementation through national environmental legislation over time • Public dialogues attract people that are new to the concept of Rio Convention mainstreaming, as well as detractors, with the assumption that dialogues will help change attitudes in a positive way • The right representation from

	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline	End of Project Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions
		<p>limitation to meeting obligations under the Rio Conventions.</p>	<p>two (2) media sensitization panel discussions held, one held each year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 12 articles and at least 2 per year on linkages between the global environment and socio-economic issues published • At least six (6) sets of English training courses with at least 30 stakeholders participating in each course. • At least 180 stakeholders will benefit from the English language courses by the end of the project. 		<p>the various government ministries, departments, and agencies participate in project activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is sufficient commitment from policy-makers to maintain long-term support to public awareness raising activities • Development partners implementing parallel public awareness campaigns are willing to modify, as appropriate, their activities to supporting the awareness activities of the present project to create synergies and achieve cost-effectiveness • Articles published in the popular media will be read and not skipped over • Brochures will be read and the content absorbed

	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline	End of Project Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions

Annex B: List of Documents to be reviewed by the Evaluator

Document	Description
Project document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Document
Project reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inception Report • Quarterly Progress Reports • Annual Project Report to GEF • GEF focal area tracking tools • Mid-term Evaluation Report
Technical documents produced by the project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report on proposed New Parking Management Strategy • Recommendations for the achievement of Tram Priority in Bratislava • Support for the Non-motorized Transport Mode in Bratislava – Final Report + 2 Annexes (Rules for bicycle parking , Methodology for designing cycling routes in Bratislava) • Final Report and recommendations for the City of Bratislava for Car-sharing arrangements • Recommendations for Car-pooling development in Bratislava • Methodology for monitoring of CO2 emissions in Bratislava coming from transport • Project documentation for a pilot project dealing with improvements of PT stops under the SNP Bridge enabling access also for disabled people • Documentation for a pilot project for adaptation of one pedestrian crossing over the tram rail at Racianska to support the tram priority and to improve the pedestrians safety •
Other relevant materials:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SC meeting minutes • Project budget revisions • Financial Audit Reports 2010- 2012 • National strategic and legal documents

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the Project relevant to UNDP objectives? • Is the Project relevant to Timor Leste’s environmental objectives? • Does the Project address the needs of target beneficiaries? • Is the Project internally coherent in its design? • How is the Project complementary to activities of other stakeholders and donors active in the region or the country? • How could the Project better target and address the priorities and development challenges of targeted beneficiaries? 			
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent are the outputs and activities of the project consistent with the intended project objectives • • and goal? • To what extent have implemented outputs produced or contributed to attaining the expected outcomes? • How was risk and risk mitigation being managed? • What lessons have been learnt for the Project to achieve its outcomes? • What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the Project in order to improve the achievement of the Project’ expected results? 			

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How could the Project be more effective in achieving its results? 			
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use? • Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for Project management and producing accurate and timely financial information? • Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and respond to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes? • Was Project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual) • Was the leveraging of funds (co-financing) happening as planned? • Were the findings, lessons learned and recommendations shared among Project stakeholders for ongoing Project adjustment and improvement? • Did the Project mainstream gender/ vulnerable groups considerations into its implementation? • Which partnerships/linkages were facilitated? Can be considered sustainable? • Did the Project take into account local capacity in design and implementation of the Project? 			
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 sustainability issues adequately integrated in Project design? • Did the Project adequately address financial and economic sustainability issues? 			

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there evidence that Project partners will continue their activities beyond Project support? • Are policies and frameworks being addressed through the Project, in order to address sustainability of key initiatives and reforms? • Is the capacity in place at the national and local levels adequate to ensure sustainability of the results achieved to date? • Are Project activities and results being replicated elsewhere and/or scaled up? • What are the main challenges that may hinder sustainability of results? 			
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"> • Will the project achieve its long-term goal? • What is the level of sensitization and awareness about the sustainable transport? • What is the impact of awareness raising in private, public and/or at individual levels? • Were cross-cutting issues identified and reflected during the project implementation? • How could the Project build on its apparent successes and learn from its weaknesses in order to enhance the potential for impact of ongoing and future initiatives? 			

Annex D: Rating Scales

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

Annex E: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

Evaluators:

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

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form⁵

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

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

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

Signed at *place* on *date*

Signature: _____

Annex F: Evaluation Report Outline⁶

- i. Opening page:
 - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
 - UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
 - Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
 - Implementing Partner and other project partners
 - Evaluation team members
 - Acknowledgements
 - ii. Executive Summary
 - Project Summary Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Evaluation Rating Table
 - Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
 - iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
(See: UNDP Editorial Manual⁷)
 1. Introduction
 - Purpose of the evaluation
 - Scope & Methodology
 - Structure of the evaluation report
 2. Project description and development context
 - Project start and duration
 - Problems that the project sought to address
 - Immediate and development objectives of the project
 - Baseline Indicators established
 - Main stakeholders
 - Expected Results
 3. Findings
(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be rated⁸)
 - 3.1 Project Design / Formulation
 - Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
 - Assumptions and Risks
 - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
 - Planned stakeholder participation
 - Replication approach
 - UNDP comparative advantage
 - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
 - Management arrangements
 - 3.2 Project Implementation
 - Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
 - Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
 - 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 Resident Representative

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____