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 *Ten Island Challenge: De-risking the Transition of the Caribbean from Fossil Fuels to Renewables* (PIMS 5526)

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: |  | | | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | | 9112 |  | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | | 00095631 | GEF financing: | 1,826,484 | | 1,826,484 |
| Country: | | Regional | IA/EA own: | 4,550,000 | | 4,550,000 |
| Region: | | RBLAC | Government: |  | |  |
| Focal Area: | | Climate Change | Other: | 300,000,000 | | 300,000,000 |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | | SP 1. Promoting access to clean and affordable energy services  SP 2. Promoting low emission and climate resilient urban and transport infrastructure (CCM Program 3) | Total co-financing: | 304,550,000 | | 304,550,000 |
| Executing Agency: | | UNDP | Total Project Cost: | 306,376,484 | | 306,376,484 |
| Other Partners involved: | | Rocky Mountain Institute/Carbon War Room | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | | 15 March 2016 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | | Proposed:  30 June 2019 | Actual:  30 June 2019 |

Objective and Scope

The objective of the Ten Island Challenge (TIC) is to accelerate the transition of Caribbean island economies from heavy dependence on fossil fuels to a diverse platform of renewables and energy efficiency, thereby establishing a blueprint for other isolated economies. By accelerating the transition of islands to renewable energy sources, national governments can accomplish the following: lower electricity costs in the household and industry sectors; increased private investment on-island with the introduction of more and higher skilled jobs; lower GHGs and less local pollution; improved energy efficiency across different sectors and less money spent on fuel.

For this initiative, CWR will track the following key performance targets as a way of measuring success. The overall goal will be to have the islands participating in the program achieve renewable energy penetration that amounts to 20-50% share of RE in the power generation mix by 2030.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Outcome 1. Policy De-risking Measures:** | Island-wide de-risked enabling environment for low GHG development through the demonstration of innovative policy tools |
| Output 1.1 Clean energy action plans to meet Ten Island Challenge targets in the Caribbean developed: | Goals and vision statements for each island participant with commitments and resources to meet them  Renewable energy and energy efficiency strategies and assessments on selected islands with specific targets that are inclusive, gender responsive and human rights-based and include recommendations for clean energy livelihoods initiatives |
| Output 1.2 Policy de-risking analysis and guidance for Ten Island Challenge countries in the Caribbean provided: | Use of de-risking tools to low carbon energy technologies in the Caribbean context  Model twelve possible Resource Conservations Measures (RCMs) for health centers  Regional guide development (including support for grid integration and energy efficiency in hospitals)  Transformation of the market and regulatory framework to demonstrate effective grid integration or renewable energy resources across the Caribbean |

An important challenge for any utility dealing with large-scale renewable energy investments is integrating intermittent resources into the grid. Conventional power plants cannot be brought on and off-line quickly enough in response to changes in wind and solar power production with the changing weather. There are a number of technologies and practices that help mitigate this risk, as well as energy storage options. With smarter grid devices and software – combined with changes in government policy and utility practice – the grid infrastructure can do a better job absorbing intermittent energy supplies with minimal curtailment or risk to power lines, transformers, etc. CWR will put together a resource guide with case studies (including the use of innovative technology and the design instructive policy and regulatory changes) that demonstrate effective grid integration of renewable resources. This analysis will be tailored to the Caribbean context and will offer practical advice and guidance to utilities, regulators, private developers and others seeking to ensure that as many MW of renewable energy can be delivered through the grid as possible.

Based on the available data points and interviews with hospital/health facility officials, CWR will establish a benchmark energy use index for a typical hospital as a foundation for the comparison of building-wide, energy savings potential. The team will model twelve possible Resource Conservations Measures (RCMs) for their savings potential and cost savings and develop a tool to allow properties to input simple property-specific information such as number of beds, age of property and utility rates to construct energy savings scenarios and likely returns on investment. CWR will also develop an Energy Retrofit Guide that addresses a whole building approach and process. The guide will be disseminated across the region, and GEF funding would support dissemination costs.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Outcome 2. Institutional and Technical Capacity:** | Strengthened island capacity for integrated low GHG technical and institutional stakeholder planning and coordination |
| Output 2.1 Caribbean platforms for clean energy technology research, development, transfer and adoption enabled: | Caribbean Energy Transition Community of Practice for government officials, utility and other networking and coordination bodies (e.g. CARILEC, CARICOM, CDB, CCCCC) As part of the COP, a network of young leaders will be created to identify and nurture youth to transition and lead the clean energy sustainable development agenda in the Caribbean  The virtual Caribbean energy transition platform will host a number of project related templates including standard Purchasing Power Agreement templates, Standard Engineering, Procurement and Construction contract templates, checklists for bankability, etc. This Community of Practice will support a pipeline of bankable projects that are eligible for financing  Gender responsive mechanisms will be put in place to support technology transfer through consultation with an inclusive stakeholder base |
| Output 2.2 Skills and expertise in island-wide clean energy investment de-risking and market transformation built: | Gender responsive regional workshops and capacity building for knowledge-sharing and lessons learnt  Follow-up tools, guidance and materials to measure and ensure the impact of capacity interventions |

To facilitate the sharing of knowledge, tools and technology across the participating countries – and build the capacity of utility and government officials with grid integration – a sustainable community of practice (CoP) and on-line forum will be created. This CoP will be a peer network and target utility engineers, government energy practitioners and development partners active in the renewable space. With a range of on-line resources, discussion fora and in-person meetings, the CoP will promote and facilitate a culture of information sharing. The result of this cross-fertilization of ideas and experience will be to build the capacity and inform decision making across the network about how best to solve the barriers that inhibit the growth of renewable energy generation. Training workshops that include utility and government leaders from all participants in the Ten Island Challenge (TIC), with all associated materials and follow-up to measure impact of these events.

As part of the CoP, a network of young leaders will be created to support the identification and nurturing of youth who are keen to lead the energy agenda in the region and ensure that energy transition is sustainable. The network will help:

* Strengthen the learning platform for the Caribbean Energy Transition;
* Highlight the leadership on the energy agenda that Caribbean islands are keen to demonstrate;
* Highlight the position of islands leading the demonstration of solutions to climate change;
* Establish an engagement programme specifically designed for the region, led by young individuals from the region; and
* Build on the innovation from this generation of leaders to develop a framework for the future of sustainable energy and economic growth.
* Encourage the active participation of women and girls in all aspects of the renewable and energy efficiency space

The virtual Caribbean Energy Transition Community of Practice will host a number of project related templates including standard Purchasing Power Agreement templates, standard Engineering, Procurement and Construction contract templates, checklists for bankability, etc. This virtual platform will facilitate knowledge around the steps, studies and information required to support a bankable renewable project.

Skills-training workshops will be gender-responsive by mainstreaming the role of women in the RE/EE space. Women will be trained and equipped with the knowledge and skills necessary to transition into, or develop further in the RE/EE space.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Outcome 3. Investment Projects and Financial Mechanisms:** | Catalyzed island funding for low GHG technology deployment. |
| Output 3.1 Caribbean energy resource capacity established: | Ten Island Challenge-wide gender responsive renewable energy assessments, feasibilities and analyses. Resource technical, economic and financial potential |
| Output 3.2 Clean energy island-wide investments leveraged: | De-risked equity/lending structures and other financing mechanisms to deliver on Caribbean clean energy targets  Feasible investment project pipeline (400 MW) across Ten Island Challenge participant countries applying the Islands Playbook  Plans for clean energy operation and maintenance in place  Goals and vision statements for each island participant that outlines the overall goal for the island (X% of renewable energy by Year Y) with a commitment of staff and other resources needed to meet that commitment (Phase 1 and 2 of Islands Playbook).  Development of investments that take account of the varying needs of rural communities and marginalized groups. |

The success of this project will be evaluated in large part by the number of MW of renewable energy generation (as well as MW saved through efficiency) developed under the project. This work will involve island-wide, renewable energy assessments, including renewable resource potential, technical/economic assessments of individual projects, feeder specific grid integration studies and potential equity/lending structures to present to investors and lending institutions. Operation and maintenance plans are included as well (Phase 3-6 of the Islands Playbook). Phase 3 (Project preparation) involves the identification and prioritization of bankable projects, further to the confirmation of country level commitments (Phase 2). As such, the main criteria for pipeline selection will be geographical distribution across participant TIC islands. The pipeline results from: (a) the set-up of project development guidelines, (b) RE project development best-practices, (c) project risk mitigation; leading to, (d) the preparation of request for proposals (RFP), (e) the selection and negotiation with selected vendor(s), and finally (f) the commercial agreement and financing for the project to start. The Table 4 lists the preliminary capacity and project pipeline targets that have been set during the project period:

Table 4. Installed and committed capacity targets.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Activity (70% of which is wind and PV) | Total MW Installed and Committed |
| Wind, PV, energy storage projects in 2015 | 40 (28) |
| Wind, PV, energy storage projects in 2016 | 100 (70) |
| Wind, PV, energy storage projects in 2017 | 280 (196) |
| TOTAL (Installed and Committed) | 400 (294 PV/wind)[[1]](#footnote-1) |
| TOTAL (Installed) | 85 MW |

The Project forms part of a wider initiative – the Island’s Energy Programme – which is funded by various other, non-GEF sources and implemented by RMI/CWR and other partners across the Caribbean. The GEF grant covered a series of specific interventions in the Bahamas, Belize, Grenada, Saint Lucia and Saint Vincent & the Grenadines. This Terminal Evaluation will focus only on those components of the Programme that are funded and supported by the GEF grant.

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 method[[2]](#footnote-2) 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 ([*Annex C*](#_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), including the following project sites: Saint Lucia 3 MW solar PV project near Hewonarra International Airport; Saint Vincent and the Grenadines 500 kW solar PV project at Argyle International Airport. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

*Barrymore Felicien, Government of Saint Lucia*

*Victor Emmanuel, LUCELEC;*

*Ellsworth Dacon, Government of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines,*

*Vaughn Lewis, VINLEC*

*Cletus Bertin, Director, CARILEC*

*Kurt Inglis, Ministry of Sustainable Development, Government of St. Lucia*

*Christopher Joseph, Energy Officer, Ministry of Finance and Energy, Grenada*

*Ryan Cobb, Energy Officer, Ministry of Public Service, Energy and Public Utilities, Bahamas*

*Rhianna Neely, Environmental Policy, Climate Change Risk Perception, Belize*

*Katya Whyte, Justin Locke, Chris Burgess, Kaitlyn Bunker, Roy Torbert – RMI/CWR*

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Ratings:** | | | |
| **1. Monitoring and Evaluation** | ***rating*** | **2. IA& EA Execution** | ***rating*** |
| 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** | **rating** | **4. Sustainability** | **rating** |
| 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 |  |  |  |  | 304,550,000 |  | 304,550,000 |  |
| * In-kind support | 200,000 |  |  |  |  |  | 200,000 |  |
| * Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals | 200,000 |  |  |  | 304,550,000 |  | 304,750,000 |  |

Mainstreaming

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will comprehensively 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. This analysis is critical for an understanding of how the project addressed cross-cutting issues and the extent to which it reflected an appreciation of the nexus between energy and sustainable human development.

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, c) energy-related impact results (emissions avoided, energy saved, increase in installed renewable energy capacity), d) leveraged new sources of financing and investment and/or e) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.[[3]](#footnote-3)

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 Multi-Country Office for Barbados and the OECS in Barbados. The UNDP MCO 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 *20* days according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | *3* days | *7 calendar days after contract signature* |
| **Evaluation Mission** | *5* days | *26 calendar days after contract signature* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | *8* days | *27 calendar days after contract signature* |
| **Final Report** | *4* days | *61 calendar days after contract signature* |

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluator 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**.

All reports must be presented in **English**.

Team Composition

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

The Team members must present the following qualifications:

* Minimum *10* years of relevant professional experience
* Experience and knowledge of UNDP and GEF

Experience and knowledge in development cooperation projects related to climate change and/or energy

* Demonstrated experience conducting results‐based monitoring and impact evaluations for sustainable development programmes/projects;
* Technical knowledge in climate change mitigation
* 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'](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines)

Payment modalities and specifications

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *10%* | At submission of Inception Report and work plan |
| *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

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

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

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Primary applicable 2014-2017 UNDP Strategic Plan Key Result Area: Sustainable Development Pathways**  **Outcome 1: Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded**  Indicator 1.3 Annual emissions of carbon dioxide (in million metric tonnes)  Indicator 1.4 Coverage of cost-efficient and sustainable energy, disaggregated by rural/urban  Output 1.4. Scaled up action on climate change adaptation and mitigation across sectors which is funded and implemented  Output 1.5. Inclusive and sustainable solutions adopted to achieve increased energy efficiency and universal modern energy access (especially off-grid sources of renewable energy) | | | | | |
| **Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program:** GEF-6 CCM-1 Strategic Programs 1 and 2 | | | | | |
| **Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:** Outcomes A, B and C for accelerated adoption of innovative technologies, policy frameworks and financial mechanisms for GHG emission reductions | | | | | |
| **Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:**  Market penetration of on-grid RE (% from renewables)  GHG emissions from electricity generation (tons CO2eq/kWh and $/tons CO2eq)  no. of jobs/beneficiaries | | | | | |
|  | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Targets**  **End of Project** | **Source of verification** | **Assumptions** |
| **Project Objective: [[4]](#footnote-4)** To accelerate the transition of Caribbean island economies from heavy dependence on fossil fuels to a diverse platform of RE/EE | * Number of countries signed on the Ten Island Challenge * CO2 emission reductions/year * % share of RE in the power generation mix of TIC countries | * 0 * 0 * 1-7%[[5]](#footnote-5) | * 10 * 137 ktCO2 * 20-50%[[6]](#footnote-6) | * Project final report * Annual surveys of energy consumption and reductions for each RE project * Electric utility reports on grid penetration * GHG inventories | * Economic growth across islands will continue * Island-wide government support for renewables development and utilization will not change |
| **Outcome 1: [[7]](#footnote-7)**  Policy De-risking Measures  Island-wide de-risked enabling environment for low GHG development through innovative policy tools | * Number of RE/EE strategies and assessments with specific targets * Number of countries where implementation of comprehensive measures (plans, strategies, policies, programmes and budgets) to achieve low-emission and climate-resilient development objectives have improved (SP 1.4.2) * Number of islands applying the de-risking method, resource conservation measures and Ten Island Challenge tools * Number of Resource Conservation Measures (RCMs) modelled for health centres | * 0 * 0 * 0 * 0 | * 5 * 7 * 5 * 12 | * Gender responsive studies/assessments of de-risking RE/EE investment options * Annual project reviews of key performance indicators * Gender responsive national policy or planning documents | * Island-wide support for policy reform to promote RE continues * Technical capacity to apply tools does not delay adoption of RE policy measures |
| **Outcome 2:**  Institutional and Technical Capacity  Strengthened island capacity for integrated low GHG technical and operational planning and coordination | * Number of stakeholder partnerships active in Ten Island Challenge KM platforms disaggregated by sex, by age and by rural and urban * Number of local counterparts with improved capacity to partake in RE/EE developments disaggregated by sex, by age and by rural and urban | * 0 * 10-50[[8]](#footnote-8) | * 2 * 300-800 | * Gender responsive workshop and seminar proceedings * Training evaluations by participants | * Local and regional stakeholders continue to be engaged during the various phases of the Ten Island Challenge |
| **Outcome 3:**  Investment Projects and Financial Mechanisms  Catalyzed island funding for low GHG technology deployment | * Installed RE capacity through Ten Island Challenge * Number of jobs and livelihoods/beneficiaries from Ten Island Challenge, disaggregated by sector and sub-sector, by sex, age, and excluded groups and by wage category were available and by rural and urban * Capital mobilised following support by Ten Island Challenge * Number of new development partnerships with funding for improved energy efficiency and/or sustainable energy solutions targeting underserved communities/groups and women (SP1.5.1) | * 0 * 0 * $3million * 0 | * 85 MW of installed capacity. * 209 MW of committed RE capacity * 700-1,000; 40% women * >US$63 million * 4 | * Feasibility studies of RE technologies * Bankable project reports * PPAs and approval permits * Work inspection reports * MOU, grant or loan approvals or other partnership agreements | * Sufficient annual replenishment of RE development funds * Capacity of government does not substantially delay approval of RE policies and RE projects |

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

1. *PIF*
2. *Project Document*
3. *HACT Assessment*
4. *Inception Report*
5. *Letter (s) of Agreement*
6. *CDRs*
7. *FACE Forms*
8. *Quarterly Narrative Progress Reports*
9. *Financial Audit Reports*
10. *Asset Registry*
11. *Annual Reports (PIRs)*
12. *Site Visit/Field Reports*
13. *National Integrated Resource Plans (IRPs)*
14. *News/Media Reports*
15. *CAREC Reports*
16. *Sustainability Plan/Exit Strategy*
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? | | | | |
|  | * 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? | * The project includes the relevant GEF outcomes, outputs and indicators * The project makes explicit links with global climate action goals (e.g. SE4ALL) | * Project Document * GEF 5 Focal Area Strategies * PIF | * Desk Review of Documents |
|  | * Is the project aligned to National development objectives, broadly, and to national energy transition priorities specifically? | * The project design includes explicit links (indicators, outputs, outcomes) to the national development policy/national energy policies. | * Project Document * National development strategies, energy policies, Nationally Determined Contributions, etc. * PIF | * Desk Review of Documents |
|  | * Is the project relevant to stated regional development objectives as defined by CARICOM, OECS and other regional frameworks? | * Explicit links are made within the project to regional development policies, action plans and associated initiatives such as the CARICOM Energy Policy. | * Project Document * CARICOM Energy Policy * PIF | * Desk Review of Documents |
|  | * Is the project’s Theory of Change relevant to addressing the development challenge(s) identified? | * 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 (Policy, institutional/technical capacity and financial) | * Project Document * PIF | * Desk Review of Documents |
|  | * Does the project directly and adequately address the needs of beneficiaries at local and regional levels? | * The Theory of Change clearly identifies beneficiary groups and defines how their capabilities will be enhanced by the project. | * Project Document * PIF | * Desk Review of Documents |
|  | * Is the project’s results framework relevant to the development challenges and are results at the appropriate level? | * The project results framework adequately measures impact * The project indicators are SMART * Indicator baselines are clearly defined and populated and milestones and targets are * The results framework is comprehensive and demonstrates systematic links to the theory of change | * Project Document * PIF | * Desk Review of Documents |
|  | * Is the project appropriately aligned with relevant UN system priorities, including thematic objectives at the national/regional and international levels? | * 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 | * Project Document * UNDP CPD, UNDAF, SP | * Desk Review of Documents |
|  | * Have the relevant stakeholders been adequately identified and have their views, needs and rights been considered during design and implementation? | * The stakeholder mapping and associated engagement plan includes all relevant stakeholders and appropriate modalities for engagement. * Planning and implementation have been participatory and inclusive | * Stakeholder mapping/engagement plan and reporting * Quarterly Reports * Annual Reports (PIR) * Stakeholder Consultation Reports | * Desk Review of Documents * Stakeholder Interviews |
|  | * 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? | * A Partnership framework has been developed that incorporates parallel initiatives, key partners and identifies complementarities | * Project Document * Quarterly Reports * Annual Reports (PIR) * Stakeholder mapping/engagement plan and reporting | * Desk Review of Documents * Stakeholder Interviews |
|  | * Have relevant lessons learned from previous projects informed the design, implementation, risk management and monitoring of the project? | * Lessons learned are explicitly identified and integrated into all aspects of the Project Document | * Project Document * PIF | * Desk Review of Documents |
|  | * Did the project design adequately identify, assess and design appropriate mitigation actions for the potential social and environmental risks posed by its interventions? | * The SES checklist was completed appropriately and all reasonable risks were identified with appropriate impact and probability ratings and risk mitigation measures specified | * Project Document * SES Annex | * Desk Review of Documents |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | | | |
|  | * Has the project achieved its output and outcome level objectives? | * The project has met or exceeded the output and outcome indicator end-of-project targets | * Quarterly Reports * Annual Reports (PIR) * Monitoring Reports * Beneficiary testimony * Site visit/field reports * Pilot Data Analysis/Reports | * Desk Review of Documents * Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries * Site visits | |
|  | * Were lessons learned captured and integrated into project planning and decision-making? | * Lessons learned have been captured periodically and/or at project end | * Steering Committee Meeting Minutes * Quarterly Reports * Annual Reports (PIR) | * Desk Review of Documents * Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries | |
|  | * How well were risks (including those identified in the Social and Environmental Screening (SES) Checklist), assumptions and impact drivers being managed? | * A clearly defined risk identification, categorization and mitigation strategy (updated risk log in ATLAS) | * ATLAS Risk Log * M&E Reports | * Desk Review of Documents * Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries | |
|  | * Were relevant counterparts from government and civil society involved in project implementation, including as part of the project steering committee? | * The steering committee participation included representatives from key institutions in Government | * Steering Committee Meeting Minutes | * Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries | |
|  | * Has the project contributed directly to any changes in legislation or policy in line with the project’s objectives? | * Draft legislation has been developed or enacted to catalyse the reduction of barriers to the increased penetration of renewable energy/energy efficient technologies | * Draft legislation * Policy Documents * Action/Implementation Plans | * Desk Review of Documents | |
|  | * Is there evidence that the project outcomes have contributed to better preparations to cope with natural disasters? | * The project has directly contributed to reductions in one or more vulnerabilities associated with natural disasters | * Quarterly Reports * Annual Reports (PIR) * Stakeholder/beneficiary testimony | * Desk Review of Documents * Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries | |
|  | * 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.) | * A gender mainstreaming plan was 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 | * Gender Mainstreaming Plan * Project Document * Stakeholder analysis and engagement plan | * Desk Review of Documents | |
| * Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? | | | | | |
|  | * Did the project adjust dynamically to reflect changing national priorities/external evaluations during implementation to ensure it remained relevant? | * 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 | * Annual Work Plans * Steering Committee Meeting Reports * Quarterly Reports * Annual Reports (PIR) * Stakeholder/beneficiary testimony * Revised Project Results Framework | * Desk Review of Documents * Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries | |
|  | * To what extent were the Project results delivered with the greatest value for money? | * Value for money analyses, requests for information, market surveys and other market intelligence were undertaken for key procurements. * Procurement is done on a competitive basis, where relevant. | * VFM, RFI, Market Surveys * Procurement Evaluation Documents | * Desk Review of Documents * Interviews with project staff and government stakeholders | |
|  | * 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? | * 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 | * Annual Work Plans * Steering Committee Meeting Reports * Quarterly Reports * Annual Reports (PIR) | * Desk Review of Documents * Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries | |
|  | * Was the level of implementation support provided by UNDP adequate and in keeping with the implementation modality and any related agreements (i.e. LOA)? | * 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 | * LOA (s)/Cooperation Agreement(s) * UNDP project support documents (emails, procurement/recruitment documents) * Quarterly Reports * Annual Reports (PIR) | * Desk Review of Documents * Interviews with project staff, UNDP personnel | |
|  | * Have the capacities of the executing institution(s) and counterparts been properly considered when the project was designed? | * An ex-ante analysis was undertaken of the internal control framework and internal capacities of the IP * An ex-ante capacity 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 | * HACT Assessment(s) * Capacity Assessments | * Desk Review of Documents | |
|  | * Has the M&E plan been well-formulated, and has it served as an effective tool to support project implementation. | * The M&E plan has an adequate budget and was adequately funded * The logical framework was used during implementation as a management and M&E tool * There was compliance with the financial and narrative reporting requirements (timeliness and quality) * Monitoring and reporting has been at both the activity and results levels | * Project Document * M&E Plan * AWPs * FACE forms * Quarterly Narrative Reports * Site visit reports | * Desk Review of Documents * Interviews with project staff and government stakeholders | |
|  | * Has the project adequately used relevant national systems (procurement, recruitment, payments) for project implementation where possible? | * 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 | * Procurement/Recruitment reports * FACE forms * CDRs | * Desk Review of Documents * Interviews with project staff and government stakeholders | |
|  | * Were financial audit/spot check findings adequately addressed and relevant changes made to improve financial management? | * Appropriate management responses and associated actions were taken in response to audit/spot check findings. * Successive audits demonstrated improvements in financial management practices | * Project Audit Reports | * Desk Review of Documents | |
| * Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | | | |
|  | * Are there financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes? | * The exit strategy includes explicit interventions to ensure financial sustainability of relevant activities | * Project Exit Strategy * Risk Log | * Desk Review of Documents | |
|  | * Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits? | * The exit strategy identifies relevant socio-political risks and includes explicit interventions to mitigate same | * Project Exit Strategy * Risk Log | * Desk Review of Documents | |
|  | * Have key stakeholders identified their interest in project benefits beyond project-end and accepted responsibility for ensuring that project benefits continue to flow? | * 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 | * Project Exit Strategy * Risk Log * MOU(s) | * Desk Review of Documents | |
|  | * Are there ongoing activities that may pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outcomes? | * The exit strategy identifies relevant environmental risks and includes explicit interventions to mitigate same | * Project Exit Strategy * Risk Log | * Desk Review of Documents | |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?** | | | | | |
|  | * Are there verifiable improvements in ecological status, or reductions in ecological stress, that can be linked directly to project interventions? | * The project has contributed directly to improved ecological conditions, including through reduced GHG emissions for energy generation and transportation | * Quarterly Reports * Annual Reports (PIR) * Monitoring Reports * Pilot Data Analysis/Reports | * Desk Review of Documents * Site visits | |

Annex D: Rating Scales

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution*** | ***Sustainability ratings:*** | ***Relevance ratings*** |
| 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 | 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability | 2. Relevant (R) |
| 3. Moderately Likely (ML):moderate risks | 1.. Not relevant (NR) |
| 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks  1. Unlikely (U): severe risks | ***Impact Ratings:***  3. Significant (S)  2. Minimal (M)  1. Negligible (N) |
| *Additional ratings where relevant:*  Not Applicable (N/A)  Unable to Assess (U/A | | |

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 Form[[9]](#footnote-9)**

**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 Outline[[10]](#footnote-10)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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 Manual[[11]](#footnote-11)) |
| **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 rated[[12]](#footnote-12)) |
| **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 Country Office

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. This figure includes 106 MW target for energy storage (mainly electricity battery-based type, with potential thermal water heating applications) estimated to trigger of $79.5m of investment (i.e. $0.8-0.9m per MW installed). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. 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](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROtI%20Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Objective (Atlas output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Source: IRENA. Figures range across islands from 1% in Bahamas, to 7% in Grenada [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Source: Carbon War Room [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. All outcomes monitored annually in the APR/PIR. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. These personnel are from the Energy Unit [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)