

TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

Consultancy Title:	Consultant for the FREPP Final Evaluation
Project Name:	FREPP (Fiji Renewable Energy Power Project)
Type of Contract:	Individual Contractor
Post Title:	International Consultant
Duty Station:	Home-based, and Suva
Languages required:	English
Duration of Contract:	21 st September to 31 st October 2018

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 *Fiji Renewable Energy Power Project (FREPP)* (PIMS #4358).

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Fiji Renewable Energy Power Project (FREPP)			
GEF Project ID:	4131	Project Financing	<u><i>at endorsement</i></u> <u><i>(Million US\$)</i></u>	<u><i>at completion</i></u> <u><i>(Million US\$)</i></u>
UNDP Project ID:	4358	GEF financing:	975,000	975,000
Country:	Fiji	IA/EA own:	N/A	N/A
Region:	Asia-Pacific	Government:	1,553,673	4,478,673 (MTR)

Focal Area:	Climate Change Mitigation	Other: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Vara Renewable Energy - FSC Labasa Cogen Plant - Secretariat of the Pacific Community 	15,000,000 0 0	Cancelled 17,000,000 11,250
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	GEF-4 Strategic Program 3: Promoting market approaches for the supply of renewable electricity in utility scale grid-based power systems; and GEF-4 Strategic Program 4: Promoting sustainable energy production from biomass and modern uses of biomass.	Total co-financing:	16,553,673	21,489,923 (MTR)
Executing Agency:	Department of Energy, Ministry of Infrastructure & Transport	Total Project Cost:	17,528,673	22,464,923
Other Partners involved:	Department of National Planning (Senior Beneficiary), Fiji Electricity Authority (FEA), Fiji Commerce Commission, Ministry of Public Enterprise, Ministry of Economy, etc.	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		22/12/2011
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 22/12/2014	Actual: 31/05/2018

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project focuses on the removal of barriers (policy, regulatory, market, finance, and technical) to the wide-scale use of RE resources for grid-connected power generation in Fiji. It is in line with the GEF-4 Strategic Program 3 on promoting market approaches for the supply of renewable electricity in utility scale grid-based power systems; and Strategic Program 4, on promoting sustainable energy production from biomass and modern uses of biomass. The project consists of 4 main components, each addressing specific categories of barriers, and these are: (1) Energy Policy & Regulatory Frameworks; (2) RE Resource Assessments and RE-based Project Assessments; (3) RE-based Power Generation Demonstrations; and, (4) RE Institutional Strengthening. FREPP is expected to facilitate investments in RE-based power generation in Fiji, which will not only support the socio-economic development of the country, make use of the country's RE resources and reduced GHG emissions. The expected outcomes of the project are:

- Outcome 1: Facilitation of investments on energy projects, particularly on RE and biomass-based power generation;
- Outcome 2: Technical feasibility of harnessing RE resources are ascertained and made widely known;
- Outcome 3: Markets for specific renewable energy technologies are supported; and
- Outcome 4: RE developments integrated into National Energy Plan towards 100% Electrification of Fiji.

The project was designed for a three-year timeframe and expected to complete on 28th December 2014. However, the project implementation had two extensions lasting 18 months each. The first moved the project completion date to 28th June 2016 while the second extended the project implementation period to 31st December 2017. The project final evaluation is to be conducted after the second extension period. It must be noted that the establishment of the Project Management Unit (PMU) was delayed by eight months after project endorsement. Also, the review of the Fiji National Energy Policy, which is the criteria for majority of project activities was also delayed by twelve months after project endorsement. Key project activities that were delayed by factors beyond the control of the PMU and UNDP include: (a) Delays in the government approval of some tender documents, e.g., those for Establishment of a Centralized Energy Database; (b) Changes in the plans of the Government (e.g., support on the application of a public private partnership (PPP) model on the Bukuya Micro-Hydro demonstration project; (c) cancellation of the Vara Renewable Energy demonstration project; and, (d) Natural calamities; and, (e) Force Majeure - Tropical Cyclone Winston, a category 5 cyclone that struck the country in February 2016 and affected the operations and assessment of the operating performance of bio-fuel mills that form part of the project demonstration activities. In the case of the PMU, the lack of personnel working on the project (particularly during second half of 2017) had clearly affected the implementation, management, and coordination of the project activities; and the monitoring and reporting of the project results. The non-completion of the draft Project Implementation Review (PIR) reports each year and delayed submission of such report each year, completion of Mid-Term Review recommendations among others, are clear manifestations of the negative impact of this problem that has substantially contributed to project implementation delays.

At the time of project design, the total project budget was estimated at US\$17,528,673 comprising US\$975,000 from UNDP/GEF resources, US\$1,553,673 from government co-financing, and US\$15,000,000 as co-financing from the project partner (Vara Renewable Energy, VRE). Whilst disbursement of resources from UNDP/GEF and government co-financing are being fulfilled, the same cannot be said of VRE and as such its engagement was terminated in second quarter 2013. The government and UNDP have identified an alternative demonstration project which was officially endorsed. This is the Fiji Sugar Corporation, with their bagasse-fired cogeneration project in Labasa. At the time of Mid-Term Review (MTR), the total budget was reported at US\$22,464,923, comprising US\$975,000 from UNDP/GEF resources, US\$4,478,673 from government co-financing, US\$17,000,000 co-financing (for demonstration activities) from the Fiji Sugar Corporation, and US\$11,250 as support from the Secretariat of the Pacific Community for the establishment of a centralized energy database.

The PMU is located within the Fiji Department of Energy (DoE) office and consists of a Project Coordinator and a Project Assistant. The PMU oversees the day-to-day functions of the project and reports directly to the Director of DoE, who is the Executive of the Project Board and makes management decisions in partnership with the Senior Beneficiary (a representative from the National Planning Office) and the Senior Supplier (UNDP).

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

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

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method¹ for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**, as defined and explained in the [UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects](#). A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (*fill 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. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser covering the Pacific region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Fiji, including the following project sites: *Bukuya (Ba), Fiji Sugar Corporation in Labasa, wind monitoring sites on Viti Levu, and two of the nine Biofuel Mills that have been installed and commissioned so far* (i.e., the representatives of all nine-installed biofuel mills out of the target of 20). Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum (Bukuya Co-operative, Fiji Department of Co-operative, ITLTB, District Office in Ba, Department of Energy, Clay Energy, Fiji Electricity Authority, Fiji Commerce Commission, Siwatibau & Sloan, University of the South Pacific, Fiji National University, GIMCO Nabou Green Energy, Pacific Power Association). The list should also include the following: ADB (since some of the FREPP activities have been moved to an ADB Project); the relevant Government agencies (e.g., Cabinet, Parliament) that are responsible for the approval of proposed policies, bills and regulations on energy; and some of the participants in Fiji that participated in the 2015 Renewable Energy Investment Forum.

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 (MTR), 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. The Evaluator should review if recommendations from the MTR were implemented or not, taking note of the actions that were done or not done (based on the MTR findings and recommendations) and the impacts.

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](#).

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	<i>rating</i>	2. IA& EA Execution	<i>rating</i>
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	
3. Assessment of Outcomes	<i>rating</i>	4. Sustainability	<i>rating</i>

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

Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental:	
		Overall likelihood of sustainability:	

PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

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

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

IMPACT

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

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions, recommendations** and **lessons**. Conclusions should build on findings and be based in evidence. Recommendations should be prioritized, specific, relevant, and targeted, with suggested implementers of the recommendations. Lessons should have wider applicability to other initiatives across the region, the area of intervention, and for the future.

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](#)

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

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

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 30 days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	4 days (<i>recommended: 2-4</i>)	28 th September 2018
Evaluation Mission	10 days (<i>r: 7-15</i>)	12 th October 2018
Draft Evaluation Report	5 days (<i>r: 5-10</i>)	19 th October 2018
Final Report	2 days (<i>r: 1-2</i>)	26 th October 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

One independent consultant will conduct the Final Evaluation - the international consultant with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in the Pacific and other regions globally. The international consultant cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

The international consultant shall be engaged jointly to undertake the final evaluation working concurrently according to a planned schedule. The international consultant will have the overall responsibility of organizing and completing the review and submitting the final report. The international consultant is expected to propose a work plan, budget and timelines to achieve the expected outputs with the appropriate methodology.

Reporting /Institutional Arrangements

The international consultant will report to the Team Leader for the Resilience & Sustainable Development (RSD) Unit through the Programme Analyst and focal point for FREPP.

Cumulative analysis

The proposals will be evaluated using the cumulative analysis method with a split 70% technical and 30% financial scoring. The proposal with the highest cumulative scoring will be awarded the contract. Applications will be evaluated technically, and points are attributed based on how well the proposal meets the requirements of the Terms of Reference using the guidelines detailed in the table below:

When using this weighted scoring method, the award of the contract may be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

a) responsive/compliant/acceptable, and

b) having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

* Technical Criteria weighting; 70%

* Financial Criteria weighting; 30%

The selection of the international consultant will consider the following areas:

Project Evaluator: International Consultant

- Recent completed and satisfactory work on result-based management project evaluation (8%);
- Proven experience in developing and assessing the realization of SMART indicators (8%);
- Proven experience in the evaluation/validation and development of baseline scenarios (8%);
- Proven experience in working on GEF project design or GEF project evaluations (8%);
- Tracked record of work on development projects in Fiji, the Pacific region, and/or small island developing states (8%);
- Work experience in renewable energy for at least 10 years (4%);
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and climate change mitigation; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis (8%);
- Excellent communication skills (5%);
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset (8%); and
- A University degree in climate change mitigation renewable energy, or other closely related field (5%).

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

(this payment schedule is indicative, to be filled in by the CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on their standard procurement procedures)

%	Milestone
10%	At submission of Inception Report after contract signing.
40%	Following submission and approval of the 1st draft terminal evaluation report
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-PaO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

APPLICATION PROCESS

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#)³ provided by UNDP;
- b) **CV**
- c) **Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
- d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc.), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.
- e) **Interested Candidates must accept UNDP General Terms and Conditions for Individual Consultants**

Consultancy Proposal should be sent via email to etenderbox.pacific@undp.org no later than **14th September , 2018 (Fiji Time)** clearly stating the title of consultancy applied for. Any proposals received after this date/time will not be accepted. Any request for clarification must be sent in writing, or by standard electronic communication to procurement.fj@undp.org. UNDP will respond in writing or by standard electronic mail and will send written copies of the response, including an explanation of the query without identifying the source of inquiry, to all consultants. Incomplete, late and joint proposals will not be considered and only offers for which there is further interest will be contacted. **Failure to submit your application as stated as per the application submission guide (Procurement Notice) on the above link will be considered incomplete and therefore application will not be considered.**

³

<https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/psa/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx>

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Objective / Outcome: Description of Objective / Outcome	Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	Target Level at end of project
Goal Reduction of greenhouse gas emissions from Fiji's power sector.	Cumulative greenhouse gas emission reduction from power generation in Fiji by the end of project (EOP), ktons CO ₂	316.4	935.8 ⁴
Project Objective⁵ Removal of major barriers to the widespread and cost-effective use of grid-based renewable energy supply via commercially viable renewable energy technologies	Cumulative installed new private sector-owned RE-based power generation capacity by EOP, MW	0 ⁶	4.7 ⁷
	Share of RE in Fiji's power generation mix by EOP, %	52	89.0
	Cumulative electricity production from RE-based power generation plants by EOP, GWh	494.0	1,505.1 ⁸
OUTCOME 1 Facilitation of investments on energy projects, particularly on RE and biomass-based power generation	Cumulative investment on RE-based power generation by EOP, US\$ million	0	100
Output 1.1: <u>Bio-Fuel Policy</u>	No. of proposed articles on the Bio-Fuel Policy that are endorsing RE-based power generation in Fiji	0	Dec 2012
	A cabinet-approved comprehensive Bio-fuel Policy promulgated	0	Dec 2011
	Institutional reform of DOE to effectively administer the Fiji Biofuel Act	0	Jun 2012
Output 1.2: <u>Formulation of IRR for Bio-fuel Policy</u>	No. of specific IRRs enforced by EOP	0	Dec 2013

⁴ Minimum end-of-project CO₂ emission reduction from demonstrations only (3.2 MW VRE PP, and 25% of biofuel mills operational by EOP)

⁵ Objective (Atlas output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR

⁶ Considering that FSC and Tropik Woods are not entirely IPPs.

⁷ This is minimum, taking consideration only of the 3.2 MW VRE biomass-based power plant and 5 x 300 kW diesel engines using biodiesel produced by 5 biofuel mills

⁸ This is minimum, taking consideration of baseline RE electricity + electricity generation only from VRE biomass-based PP and 5 biodiesel power generation units

	No. of revised IRRs proposed to enhance Bio-fuel Policy implementation by EOP	0	Dec 2013
Output 1.3: <u>De-Risking of Tariff Guarantee Fund</u>	No. of RE-based power generation projects that benefits from TGF by EOP	0	1
	% of approved RE-based power generation projects that benefit from the TGF by EOP	0	100
OUTCOME 2 Technical feasibility of harnessing RE resources are ascertained and made widely known	No. of identified technically viable RE projects EOP	0	6
	No. of investors that made use of available technical information on feasible RE-based energy system projects by EOP	0	20
Output 2.1: Operational Centralized Energy Database System	No. of clients that request services from the central clearinghouse for their RE-based energy systems project EOP	0	300
	No. of clients that make use of the central energy database system each year	0	150
	% of clearinghouse and central energy database system clients each year that are satisfied with the services received	0	80
	No. of implemented RE-based power generation projects that were facilitated by the central clearing house system by EOP.	0	20
Output 2.2: Completed and published RE resource assessments	No. of comprehensive RE resource assessments completed by EOP	0	12
	Average % increase in currently known RE potentials that was established after the RE resource assessments	0	Dec 2013
	No. of investors that made use of the RE resource assessment data/information in the design of their RE-based power generation projects by EOP	0	6
Output 2.3: Assessed feasibility of RE investments	No. of completed and published new feasibility studies of IPP investments by EOP	0	6
	No. of planned new feasibility analyses to be carried out (after FREPP) by EOP	0	4

	% of interested investors in Fiji that expressed confidence in the technical and financial viabilities of RE-based power generation projects by EOP	0	30
OUTCOME 3 Markets for specific renewable energy technologies are supported	No. of additional rural households that have access to green electricity by EOP.	0	10,000
	No. of financial closures achieved for new RE-based power generation projects by EOP	0	20
	No. of RET system equipment/component suppliers & distributors in Fiji by EOP	5	7
	Overall volume of business in the RE market in Fiji by EOP, US\$ million	0	100
Output 3.1: Designed and implemented RE-based power generation demonstration	Overall installed capacity of RE-based power generation demo projects by EOP, MW	0	4.7
	No. of demo projects that are both operationally and financially viable by EOP	0	10
	No. of planned RE-based power generation projects that are replicating any of the demo projects by EOP	1	16
	Total installed capacity of replication RE-based power generation projects by EOP	0	At least 3
Output 3.2: Prepared Standard Power Purchase Agreement (PPA) for IPPs	Endorsed Standard Power Purchase Agreement (SPPA) templates that are used for IPP projects in Fiji	0	1 ⁹
	No. of IPP RE-based power projects that made use of any of the approved SPPA templates by EOP	0	6
Output 3.3: Completed Investment Promotion Package	No. of prospective investors making enquiries with government agencies	0	15
	Cumulative number of investors that expressed and planned to invest & implement RE-based power generation projects by EOP	0	10

⁹ There will be only 1 standard template since there is only 1 transmission and distribution utility.

Output 3.4: Completed assessment and developed RE incentives schemes	A comprehensive report on options and issues related to the establishment of a subsidy fund for private sector renewable energy investment published	0 ¹⁰	Jun 2012
OUTCOME 4 Renewable Energy developments integrated into National Energy Plan towards 100% Electrification of Fiji.	Cabinet approved-Electrification Master Plan	0	Dec 2013
	Average annual budget for the Electrification Master Plan by EOP, US\$ million	0	10
	% utilization of Fiji's RE resources (for power purposes) by EOP	52	90
Output 4.1: Completed training programme on integrated energy planning (IEP) and administrative energy policy for government personnel	No. of GOF personnel trained on IEP and energy policy each year starting Year 2011	2	6
	% trained GOF personnel that are actively engaged in RE-based power generation policy making, planning and implementation, operations and evaluation by EOP	0	50
	No. of training institutions that are capable and qualified in IEP and energy policy training/capacity building by EOP	2	2
Output 4.2: Completed and approved National Electrification Master Plan	Cabinet approved-Electrification Master plan	0	Dec 2013
	Average annual budget for the Electrification Master Plan by EOP, US\$ million	0	10

¹⁰ Prospective private RE investors do not commit funds, as investments are commercially not viable without support. Fiji's renewable energy industry remains small and weak. RE investment remains dependent on donor funding.

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

1. *PIF 2018 Report.*
2. *UNDP Initiation Plan.*
3. *UNDP Project Document.*
4. *UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results.*
5. *Project Inception Report.*
6. *All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's).*
7. *Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams.*
8. *Audit reports.*
9. *Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm tracking tool for climate change mitigation projects.*
10. *Oversight mission reports.*
11. *All monitoring reports prepared by the project.*
12. *Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team.*

The following documents will also be available:

13. *Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems.*
14. *UNDP country/countries programme document(s).*
15. *Minutes of the FREPP Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)*
16. *Project site location maps.*

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?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•		•	•
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

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

ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

Evaluators:

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

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form¹¹

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

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

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

Signed at *place* on *date*

Signature: _____

¹¹www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE¹²

- i. Opening page:
 - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
 - UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
 - Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
 - Implementing Partner and other project partners
 - Evaluation team members
 - Acknowledgements
- ii. Executive Summary
 - Project Summary Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Evaluation Rating Table
 - Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
(See: UNDP Editorial Manual¹³)
1. Introduction
 - Purpose of the evaluation
 - Scope & Methodology
 - Structure of the evaluation report
2. Project description and development context
 - Project start and duration
 - Problems that the project sought to address
 - Immediate and development objectives of the project
 - Baseline Indicators established
 - Main stakeholders
 - Expected Results
3. Findings
(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be rated¹⁴)
- 3.1 Project Design / Formulation
 - Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
 - Assumptions and Risks
 - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
 - Planned stakeholder participation
 - Replication approach
 - 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)

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

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

¹⁴ Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

- 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
- Annexed in a separate file: TE Audit Trail
- Annexed in a separate file: Terminal GEF Tracking Tools

ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

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

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

ANNEX H: TE REPORT AUDIT TRAIL TEMPLATE

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

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

The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Terminal Evaluation report; they are referenced by institution ("Author" column) and track change comment number ("#" column):

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