****Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference

**International Terminal Evaluation Consultant**

**Project “Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) for low-carbon end-use sectors in Azerbaijan”**

Location: Baku

Application Deadline: 20-Feb-2020 COB

Type of Contract: Individual Contract

Post Level: International Consultant- Terminal Evaluator

Languages Required: English

Expected Starting Date: April 2020

Period of Contract: 25 (twenty five) consultancy days (April-2020 and July-2020)

Duration of Contract: LUMP-SUM Fixed Price contract, with 1 (one) visits to Azerbaijan.

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF Monitoring and Evaluation (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 Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) for low-carbon end-use sectors in Azerbaijan (PIMS # 5138.)

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows: (*fully complete the table below*).

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: |  | | | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | | 00090628 |  | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | | 00081318 | GEF financing: | 3 570 000 | |  |
| Country: | | Azerbaijan | IA/EA own: | 200 000 | |  |
| Region: | | RBEC | Government: | 31 7000 000 | |  |
| Focal Area: | |  | Other: |  | |  |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | |  | Total co-financing: | 117 600 | |  |
| Executing Agency: | | SOCAR | Total Project Cost: | 35 470 000 | |  |
| Other Partners involved: | | MENR | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | | 05.03.2015 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | | Proposed: | Actual: |

Objective and Scope

The project was designed to support SOCAR in the implementation of its Climate Change Mitigation Strategy by promoting and upscaling GHG mitigation measures through a programmatic NAMA approach in the low-carbon end-use sectors, where pilot investments will be directed into low energy and low carbon technologies that are so far missing on a large scale on the Azeri market. The concept of NAMAs represents a valuable opportunity for a huge enterprise, such as SOCAR, to developing and implementing a large scale GHG mitigation program that is in line with the company’s long-term sustainable development strategy and simultaneously will target the country’s institutional & policy framework, address appropriate mechanisms and result in activities to realize significant GHG emission reduction achievements in the long term.

The proposed project is set within the country’s ambitions to reduce GHG emissions and energy intensity of major energy end-use sectors in Azerbaijan and simultaneously introduce innovative energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies in main energy end-use sectors such as buildings and transportation systems.

The project has been organized around four outcomes, to be implemented over a period of five years.

* Outcome 1: Assessment of GHG emission mitigation potentials and voluntary target setting;
* Outcome 2: Design & establishment of NAMAs in oil & gas end-use sectors;
* Outcome 3: Implementation of a set of (up to 3) project NAMAs in the oil & gas end-use sector;
* Outcome 4: Monitoring, Reporting & Verification system and national registry for mitigation actions in the energy generation and end-use sectors to be set up.

The terminal evaluation will be conducted according to the UNDP guidance on final evaluations, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects. The terminal evaluation will take place over a period of four months and it will include one 10 days mission to Baku, Azerbaijan (not including weekend) and 15 home based days.

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

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method[[1]](#footnote-1) 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*](#_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 Baku, including the project sites which are mostly located within Baku’s vicinity. Interviews will be held with the key officials in the following organizations at a minimum:

* State Oil Company of Azerbaijan Republic (SOCAR) and its various departments;
* Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources (MENR);
  + National Climate Change Center (NCCC);
  + Ministry of Energy of the Republic of Azerbaijan.

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 (see  [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 Final 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]](#footnote-2)

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

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

Implementation arrangements

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

Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be *25* days (15 home based days and 10 working days (not including travel days) on mission to Baku) according to the following plan and over the period from 1st April 2020 to 31st July 2020:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | 13.04.2020 (7 days) | 21.04.2020 |
| **Evaluation Mission** | 11.05.2020 (10 days) (Mission to Baku) | 22.05.2020 |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | 01.06.2020 (6 days) | 08.06.2020 |
| **Final Report** | 15.07.2020 (2 days) | 16.07.2020 |

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following deliverables.:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 + Stocktaking Report** | Initial Findings + Stocktaking Report (National Consultant) | End of evaluation mission | To project management, UNDP CO |
| **Draft Final Report** | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft | Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC. |

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

Team Composition

The evaluation team will be composed of 1 international consultant (Team Leader) and 1 national consultant.The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating GEFprojects in Azerbaijan or in other countries. Prior experience with evaluating 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 international consultant (Team Leader) should have the followingqualifications and competencies:

* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
* Experience of working with renewable energy, energy efficiency, and climate change related project evaluations;
* Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years;
* Fluency in English; knowledge of Russian an asset;
* Experience of working in Europe and/or CIS regions will be preferred;
* Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
* Experience applying SMART (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound) indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
* Competence in adaptive management, as applied to climate change and energy efficiency;
* Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations;
* Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and climate change;
* Excellent analytical and communication skills;
* Project evaluation/review experience within United Nations system;
* A Master’s degree in climate change, energy efficiency, environmental management, energy economics, engineering, or other closely related field.

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

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *30%* | Upon submission of the Inception Report |
| *50%* | Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report, following the mission to Baku |
| *20%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report , including incorporation of responses to all comments received and presentation of revised and final report |

Application process

Applicants are requested to apply online (indicate the site, such as http://jobs.undp.org, etc.) by (date). 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

# Revised Log-Frame[[3]](#footnote-3)

|  | **Indicator** |  | **Baseline** | **Midterm Target** | **End of Project Target** | **Source of verification** | **Risks and assumptions** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Objective**  To support the development, implementation and monitoring of NAMAs in the oil/gas *and* end-use sectors, to further build on national commitment to energy savings and reducing GHG emissions | NAMA GHG mitigation action plan |  | No strategic program in place that prioritizes energy efficiency and renewable energy in oil/gas sectors | NAMA GHG mitigation action plan covering 1 sector is developed | NAMA GHG mitigation action plan covering 3 sectors is developed, approved, funded and under implementation | NAMA action plans | See the Risks and Assumptions in the Log-Frame revised by the Inception Report |
| Direct project and post-project GHG emission reductions and energy savings facilitated by the Project |  | 0 | Total lifetime direct GHG emission reductions of 10,500 t CO2eq from pilot projects implemented by 2018 | Total lifetime direct GHG emission reductions of 0.56 mil tCO2eq from implemented pilot projects  Total lifetime direct post-project GHG emission reductions of 6.24 mil tCO2eq from the NAMA action plan  Total lifetime energy saved from the NAMA action plan approx. 200,000 toe. | National NAMA registry  Specific MRV methodology and GHG emission reduction analysis |
| Co-financing leveraged for implementation of prioritized NAMA projects |  | 0 | A market-based financing structure for 20% market-based co-financing for one of the NAMA projects is structured by 2018 | A total co-financing amount of US$ 30 million is mobilized from SOCAR and market sources | Annual Progress Reports  NAMA implementation report |
| **Outcome 1:**  Assessment of GHG emission mitigation potentials and target setting completed | **Outputs:**  1.1 Relevant barriers that hinder the development and implementation of GHG mitigation measures assessed  1.2 Main oil & gas and end-use sectors having the potential for decreasing energy intensity are identified  1.3 Detailed marginal abatement cost (MAC) curves for oil & gas and end-use sectors developed to demonstrate cost-effective mitigation policies and scenarios  1.4 Government institutions gain further awareness and support in the development of a national replication strategy (national NAMA action plan)  1.5 Voluntary emission reduction targets of SOCAR’s oil & gas and end-use sub-sectors are established and validated | | | | | | |
| Sub-sector voluntary GHG emission reduction targets established |  | Lack of a framework and target-setting for reducing GHGs in energy and carbon intensive sub-sectors | GHG emission reduction targets to be defined for 3 main SOCAR’s sub-sectors by 2017: (Buildings, Transport, Oil/gas Production) | SOCAR adopts GHG reduction targets as part of its strategic plan to mitigate emissions | SOCAR documented commitments |  |
| Marginal abatement costs (MAC) curves or other justification for prioritizing GHG mitigation actions and target setting in the oil & gas and end-use sectors |  | No detailed economic reviews and scenarios that compare the effectiveness of GHG mitigation technologies | Detailed MAC curves (or other justification) for targets in oil & gas end-use sectors developed by 2017 | - | MAC analytical report |
| **Outcome 2**  NAMA action plan in oil & gas and end-use sectors developed | **Outputs:**  2.1 Fully capable and qualified private and public sector entities in the design and implementation of NAMAs  2.2 NAMA action plans designed for three main oil & gas and end-use sub-sectors for the implementation of selected prioritized feasible NAMA projects  2.3 Defined and established financial instruments for mitigation actions in the oil & gas end-use sectors | | | | | | |
|  | SOCAR’s NAMA action plan to demonstrate specific measures and actions that will lead to substantial GHG emission reductions in the long term. |  | The Government and SOCAR have a strong intention to implement NAMAs, however, a concrete strategy and framework to achieve GHG mitigation goals are missing. | SOCAR’s NAMA action plan/ program developed for implementation of selected, prioritized, and feasible NAMA projects in main oil & gas and end-use sub-sectors **(2016);**  One NAMA pilot project is funded and implemented (**2018**)  An innovative, market-based financing structure for one of the sub-sectors (most likely Buildings) is adopted by **2018**  SOCAR sets up an Information Centre for promoting Energy Efficiency (EE) in the Building and Transport sectors by **2018**  Updating of NAMAs registry is started by SOCAR by **2016** | SOCAR’s NAMA action plan/ program developed for implementation of selected, prioritized, and feasible NAMA projects in main oil & gas and end-use subsectors  Market-based financial instruments for financing implementation of NAMA action plan established.  2 major energy management workshops are successfully held.  GHG emission reductions due to pilot project are captured in SOCAR’s GHG Inventory | SOCAR’s NAMA action plan  Review of available financial instruments  Proceedings and minutes from workshops  Review of SOCAR’s Information Centre activities and documents  Review of the NAMA registry |  |
| **Outcome 3:** NAMA pilot projects in SOCAR’s oil & gas and end-use sectors | **Outputs:**  3.1 NAMA pilot 1: SOCAR’s Green Building Program implemented and knowledge about EE practices in buildings is disseminated  3.2 NAMA pilot 2: SOCAR’s Sustainable Transport Initiative implemented resulting in fuel economy in SOCAR’s transportation fleet  3.3 NAMA pilot 3: SOCAR’s associated gas capturing programme implemented (collection and supply of natural gas to meet the heating needs of the area’s inhabitants) | | | | | | |
| Energy-efficiency oriented refurbishments under SOCAR’s “Green Building Programme” |  | Absence of energy efficiency (EE) building standards for new and existing buildings; Lack of availability of green building technologies | Energy audits of 2 existing buildings is completed by 2016  Achievement of 10,500 tCO2eq emission reductions over the 25 year life-time as a result of the pilot investments in building refurbishments starting from 2018    50 persons trained in conducting energy audits by 2017 | Complete energy audits of 3-5 buildings of up to 8,000 m² space (2% of total SOCAR buildings area)  Results of energy savings and GHG reductions (420 tCO2eq) for at least one full year are reported  100 persons trained in design/construction of EE buildings, energy audits and building energy management (both SOCAR and others) | Project documents (energy audits)  GHG emission reduction calculation  Proceedings and minutes from trainings |  |
| New fuel technologies for SOCAR’s vehicle fleet and a sustainable vehicle fleet management system |  | Low penetration rate of alternative fuel systems and state-of-the-art technologies in transportation; Low energy performance of vehicles due to absence of emission and fuel economy standards. | Analytical study developed comparing different fuel technologies, electric vehicles (powered with RE), methanol mixed with gasoline, etc. for modernization of SOCAR’s vehicle fleet (2017)  Achievement of (1,593 tCO2eq) emission reductions over the 10-year life-time (starting in 2019) as a result of the pilot investments in vehicles using alternative fuel sources  Monitoring devices are installed on 10 vehicles by 2018  100 light and 200 heavy vehicles drivers of SOCAR trained on eco-driving practices. | Recommendations of the analytical study are adopted by SOCAR and its implementation is started  Results of energy savings and GHG reductions (160 tCO2eq) for at least one full year are reported  Results from monitoring of vehicles are used to measure fuel consumption/savings pattern  200 light and 500 heavy vehicles drivers of SOCAR trained on eco-driving practices. | Analytical study  Review of the MRV system on GHG emission reductions, NAMA registry  Review of documented SOCARs practices  Proceedings and minutes from trainings |
| Capture and productive use of associated gas |  | Annually, 0.3\*mln t CO2eq is dispersing in atmosphere from Siyazanneft oil-field due to outdated technology; Neighbourhood villages cut forest wood to use for heating | Selection of suitable technologies to capture associated gas and development of a plan for its effective utilization on a pilot basis by 2017  Associated gas technology installation in the oil-field begins in 2017/18  Laying of the pipes and distribution network completed by end of 2018  Direct 550,000 tCO2e emission reductions result over the 25-year lifetime due to the pilot investment  An afforestation programme approved by SOCAR | State of art technologies for associated gas capture are fully adopted by SOCAR for use in other oil-fields  The gas capture equipment including compressors are installed by end of 2018  At least, 600 households/local businesses supplied with clean and safe gas  Results of GHG reductions (22,000 tCO2eq) for at least one full year are reported  The activity results in planting of 1200 trees | Review of project documents, SOCAR practices  Review of the MRV system on GHG emission reductions, NAMA registry  Project and SOCAR reports |
| **Outcome 4**  MRV system and national registry for mitigation actions in the energy generation and end-use sectors developed | **Outputs:**   * 1. Defined and established sectoral and sub-sectoral reference baselines for oil & gas end-use sector sectors   2. Established sub-sectoral GHG inventories for key oil & gas end-use sub-sectors   4.3 Established and operational national registry mechanism for mitigation actions in the oil & gas end-use sectors | | | | | | |
| Regular GHG Inventory conducted |  | Institutional capacity to develop proper GHG inventories is lacking | Updated GHG inventories start becoming available on annual basis by end of 2017 | SOCAR has a fully up-to-date inventories register | GHG inventory |  |
| National registry mechanism for implemented NAMA projects |  | Institutional arrangement to record/report/monitor the outcomes of GHG mitigation activities is missing | National registry is regularly updated with information about NAMAs starting from 2016 | NAMA reporting at national level through a domestic mitigation registry | NAMA register |
| Arrangements for setting and monitoring sector-wide GHG emission reduction targets |  | The concerned entities lack capacity to setup near-and long-term GHG targets | Guidelines are adopted to validate baseline GHG estimates, set future targets, and measure actual emissions (by 2017) | The MRV process is fully functional in SOCAR for monitoring of the progress/outcome of NAMA implementations | MRV documents and review of SOCAR’s procedures |
| Qualified local technical professionals in SOCAR to conduct MRVs |  | Lack of common platform for sharing of expertise among departments involved in data collection, statistical analysis and mitigation planning | Trainings delivered on: Improvement of Statistical database (2016); Sectoral baselines (2017); GHG inventory estimates (2018) | A strong institutional capacity exists in SOCAR in the MRV of implemented NAMAs  12 SOCAR’s experts trained | Review of SOCAR’s procedures  Proceedings and minutes from trainings |
| Dissemination of information about the mitigation measures in energy end-use sectors and MRV framework |  | Low awareness level and information about MRV and national registry systems in GoA | SOCAR trains one high-profile organization in MRV framework development by 2018 | SOCAR trains two organizations in MRV and publishes information on MRV results and experience | Proceedings and minutes from trainings |

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

*Project Identification Form (PIF)*

*UNDP Initiation Plan*

*UNDP Project Document*

*UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results*

*Project Inception Report*

*All Project Implementation Reports (PIR’s)*

*Energy audit reports carried out during pilot activities*

*Progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams*

*MTR Report*

*Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement*

*Minutes of the Project Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)*

*Oversight mission reports*

*All monitoring reports prepared by the project*

*Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team*

*Reports of experts and contractors*

*Field visit and training reports*

*Final products delivered by the companies, digital data, maps, management plans*

*CDRs, Financial documentations as indicated above*

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.*

| **Evaluation 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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***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[[4]](#footnote-4)**

**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[[5]](#footnote-5)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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[[6]](#footnote-6)) |
| **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[[7]](#footnote-7)) |
| **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: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

## undplogo2

## UNDP-GEF Terminal Review

## Terms of Reference

**Date:** 7th February 2020

**Duty station:** Baku, Azerbaijan

**Project title:** “Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) for low-carbon end-use sectors in Azerbaijan”

**Position**: Terminal Evaluator (local)

**Duration**: 15 April 2020 to 31 July 2020

**Post Level:** Local Consultant

**Contract type:**  Individual Contract (IC)

**Location**: Baku with travels to Sumgayit city and other sites in close proximity to Baku as necessary

Proposal should be submitted by email no later than 20th February, 2020

[procurement.aze@undp.org](mailto:procurement.aze@undp.org) and copy to [nazim.mammadov@undp.org](mailto:tamirlan.gasimov@undp.org)

Any request for clarification must be sent in writing, or by standard electronic communication to the address or e-mail indicated above. UNDP in Azerbaijan will respond 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 shortlisted consultants.

1. **INTRODUCTION**

The full-sized project titled “Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) for low-carbon end-use sectors in Azerbaijan” (PIMS # 5138) – started on the 05.03.2015 – is now in the final stages of implementation through the State Oil Company of Azerbaijan Republic (SOCAR). This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the project, which is to be undertaken from April to July 2020. The conduct of the TE will be through the joint efforts of a short-term international consultant and a short-term local consultant who will work closely together in meeting all the requirements of the task. The procurement arrangements for the engagement of international consultant, who will lead the entire TE effort has been already initiated[[8]](#footnote-8). This procurement aims at hiring the services of an individual Local Consultant who will work as part of a team led by the international consultant in carrying out the various tasks up to the successful completion of the TE.

1. **OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE**

The project was designed to support SOCAR in the implementation of its Climate Change Mitigation Strategy by promoting and upscaling GHG mitigation measures through a programmatic NAMA approach in the low-carbon end-use sectors, where pilot investments will be directed into low energy and low carbon technologies that are so far missing on a large scale on the Azeri market. The concept of NAMAs represents a valuable opportunity for a huge enterprise, such as SOCAR, to developing and implementing a large scale GHG mitigation program that is in line with the company’s long-term sustainable development strategy and simultaneously will target the country’s institutional & policy framework, address appropriate mechanisms and result in activities to realize significant GHG emission reduction achievements in the long term.

The proposed project is set within the country’s ambitions to reduce GHG emissions and energy intensity of major energy end-use sectors in Azerbaijan and simultaneously introduce innovative energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies in main energy end-use sectors such as buildings and transportation systems.

The project has been organized around four outcomes, to be implemented over a period of five years.

* Outcome 1: Assessment of GHG emission mitigation potentials and voluntary target setting;
* Outcome 2: Design & establishment of NAMAs in oil & gas end-use sectors;
* Outcome 3: Implementation of a set of (up to 3) project NAMAs in the oil & gas end-use sector;
* Outcome 4: Monitoring, Reporting & Verification system and national registry for mitigation actions in the energy generation and end-use sectors to be set up.

The TE will be conducted according to the UNDP guidance on final evaluations, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects. The TE will take place over a period of four months and will require 25 days’ level-of-effort of the local consultant. The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons learned that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of future UNDP programming.

1. **EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY**

An overall approach and method[[9]](#footnote-9) for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluation effort will be based on 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.

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. Beside holding of appropriate meetings, the local consultant shall undertake field missions to the various project sites and facilities which are mostly located within Baku’s vicinity. Interviews will be held with the key officials in the following organizations at a minimum:

* State Oil Company of Azerbaijan Republic (SOCAR) and its various departments;
* Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources (MENR);
* National Climate Change Center (NCCC);
* Ministry of Energy of the Republic of Azerbaijan.

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.

1. **EVALUATION TIMEFRAME**

The total level-of- effort to be provided by the local consultant in carrying out the TE will be 25 days according to the following plan which covers the period from 1st April 2020 to 31st July 2020:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | 13.04.2020 (7 days) | 21.04.2020 |
| **Evaluation Mission** | 11.05.2020 (10 days) (Mission to Baku) | 22.05.2020 |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | 01.06.2020 (6 days) | 08.06.2020 |
| **Final Report** | 15.07.2020 (2 days) | 16.07.2020 |

1. **Evaluation deliverables**

The local consultant is expected to work alongside the international consultant through a “role-sharing” arrangement to ensure the timely delivery of the following deliverables.:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Inception Report** | Evaluator[[10]](#footnote-10) provides clarifications on timing and method | No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission of the international consultant | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO (**Prime responsibility: International Consultant**) |
| **Presentation + Stocktaking Report** | Initial Findings + Stocktaking Report | End of evaluation mission of the international consultant | Evaluator submits to project management, UNDP CO (**Prime Responsibility: National Consultant**) |
| **Draft Final Report** | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission of the international consultant | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs (**Prime responsibility: International Consultant**) |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft | Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC. (**Prime responsibility: International Consultant**) |

\*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.

1. **Team Composition**

The evaluation team will be composed of 1 international consultant (Team Leader) and 1 national consultant. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating GEF projects in Azerbaijan or in other countries. Prior experience with evaluating 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 local consultant shall have the following qualifications and competencies:

* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
* Experience of working with renewable energy, energy efficiency, and climate change related project evaluations;
* Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years;
* Fluency in English; knowledge of Russian and Azeri languages is required;
* Experience applying SMART (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound) indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
* Competence in adaptive management, as applied to climate change and energy efficiency;
* Excellent analytical and communication skills;
* Project evaluation/review experience within United Nations system;
* A Master’s degree in climate change, energy efficiency, environmental management, energy economics, engineering, or other closely related field.

1. **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)

1. **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 |
| *30%* | Upon submission of the Inception Report |
| *50%* | Upon submission and approval of the 1st draft TE report |
| *20%* | Upon submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final TE report, including incorporation of responses to all comments received |

1. **Application process**

Applicants are requested to apply online (indicate the site, such as http://jobs.undp.org, etc.) by (date). 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.

Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference (INCLUDES ANNEXES A THROUGH G)

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF Monitoring and Evaluation (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 Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) for low-carbon end-use sectors in Azerbaijan (PIMS # 5138.)

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows: (*fully complete the table below*).

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: |  | | | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | | 00090628 |  | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | | 00081318 | GEF financing: | 3 570 000 | |  |
| Country: | | Azerbaijan | IA/EA own: | 200 000 | |  |
| Region: | | RBEC | Government: | 31 7000 000 | |  |
| Focal Area: | |  | Other: |  | |  |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | |  | Total co-financing: | 117 600 | |  |
| Executing Agency: | | SOCAR | Total Project Cost: | 35 470 000 | |  |
| Other Partners involved: | | MENR | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | | 05.03.2015 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | | Proposed: | Actual: |

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method[[11]](#footnote-11) 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*](#_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 Baku, including the project sites which are mostly located within Baku’s vicinity. Interviews will be held with the key officials in the following organizations at a minimum:

* State Oil Company of Azerbaijan Republic (SOCAR) and its various departments;
* Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources (MENR);
  + National Climate Change Center (NCCC);
  + Ministry of Energy of the Republic of Azerbaijan.

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 (see  [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 Final 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.[[12]](#footnote-12)

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

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

Implementation arrangements

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

Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be *25* days according to the following plan and over the period from 1st April 2020 to 31st July 2020:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | 13.04.2020 (7 days) | 21.04.2020 |
| **Evaluation Mission of international consultant** | 11.05.2020 (10 days) (Mission to Baku) | 22.05.2020 |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | 01.06.2020 (6 days) | 08.06.2020 |
| **Final Report** | 15.07.2020 (2 days) | 16.07.2020 |

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following deliverables:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Inception Report** | Evaluator[[13]](#footnote-13) provides clarifications on timing and method | No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission of the international consultant | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO (**Prime responsibility: International Consultant**) |
| **Presentation + Stocktaking Report** | Initial Findings + Stocktaking Report | End of evaluation mission of the international consultant | Evaluator submits to project management, UNDP CO (**Prime Responsibility: National Consultant**) |
| **Draft Final Report** | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission of the international consultant | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs (**Prime responsibility: International Consultant**) |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft | Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC. (**Prime responsibility: International Consultant**) |

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

Team Composition

The evaluation team will be composed of an international consultant (Team Leader) and a national consultant. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating GEF projects in Azerbaijan or in other countries. Prior experience with evaluating 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.

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)

Application process

Applicants are requested to apply online (indicate the site, such as http://jobs.undp.org, etc.) by (date). 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

# Revised Log-Frame[[14]](#footnote-14)

|  | **Indicator** |  | **Baseline** | **Midterm Target** | **End of Project Target** | **Source of verification** | **Risks and assumptions** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Objective**  To support the development, implementation and monitoring of NAMAs in the oil/gas *and* end-use sectors, to further build on national commitment to energy savings and reducing GHG emissions | NAMA GHG mitigation action plan |  | No strategic program in place that prioritizes energy efficiency and renewable energy in oil/gas sectors | NAMA GHG mitigation action plan covering 1 sector is developed | NAMA GHG mitigation action plan covering 3 sectors is developed, approved, funded and under implementation | NAMA action plans | See the Risks and Assumptions in the Log-Frame revised by the Inception Report |
| Direct project and post-project GHG emission reductions and energy savings facilitated by the Project |  | 0 | Total lifetime direct GHG emission reductions of 10,500 t CO2eq from pilot projects implemented by 2018 | Total lifetime direct GHG emission reductions of 0.56 mil tCO2eq from implemented pilot projects  Total lifetime direct post-project GHG emission reductions of 6.24 mil tCO2eq from the NAMA action plan  Total lifetime energy saved from the NAMA action plan approx. 200,000 toe. | National NAMA registry  Specific MRV methodology and GHG emission reduction analysis |
| Co-financing leveraged for implementation of prioritized NAMA projects |  | 0 | A market-based financing structure for 20% market-based co-financing for one of the NAMA projects is structured by 2018 | A total co-financing amount of US$ 30 million is mobilized from SOCAR and market sources | Annual Progress Reports  NAMA implementation report |
| **Outcome 1:**  Assessment of GHG emission mitigation potentials and target setting completed | **Outputs:**  1.1 Relevant barriers that hinder the development and implementation of GHG mitigation measures assessed  1.2 Main oil & gas and end-use sectors having the potential for decreasing energy intensity are identified  1.3 Detailed marginal abatement cost (MAC) curves for oil & gas and end-use sectors developed to demonstrate cost-effective mitigation policies and scenarios  1.4 Government institutions gain further awareness and support in the development of a national replication strategy (national NAMA action plan)  1.5 Voluntary emission reduction targets of SOCAR’s oil & gas and end-use sub-sectors are established and validated | | | | | | |
| Sub-sector voluntary GHG emission reduction targets established |  | Lack of a framework and target-setting for reducing GHGs in energy and carbon intensive sub-sectors | GHG emission reduction targets to be defined for 3 main SOCAR’s sub-sectors by 2017: (Buildings, Transport, Oil/gas Production) | SOCAR adopts GHG reduction targets as part of its strategic plan to mitigate emissions | SOCAR documented commitments |  |
| Marginal abatement costs (MAC) curves or other justification for prioritizing GHG mitigation actions and target setting in the oil & gas and end-use sectors |  | No detailed economic reviews and scenarios that compare the effectiveness of GHG mitigation technologies | Detailed MAC curves (or other justification) for targets in oil & gas end-use sectors developed by 2017 | - | MAC analytical report |
| **Outcome 2**  NAMA action plan in oil & gas and end-use sectors developed | **Outputs:**  2.1 Fully capable and qualified private and public sector entities in the design and implementation of NAMAs  2.2 NAMA action plans designed for three main oil & gas and end-use sub-sectors for the implementation of selected prioritized feasible NAMA projects  2.3 Defined and established financial instruments for mitigation actions in the oil & gas end-use sectors | | | | | | |
|  | SOCAR’s NAMA action plan to demonstrate specific measures and actions that will lead to substantial GHG emission reductions in the long term. |  | The Government and SOCAR have a strong intention to implement NAMAs, however, a concrete strategy and framework to achieve GHG mitigation goals are missing. | SOCAR’s NAMA action plan/ program developed for implementation of selected, prioritized, and feasible NAMA projects in main oil & gas and end-use sub-sectors **(2016);**  One NAMA pilot project is funded and implemented (**2018**)  An innovative, market-based financing structure for one of the sub-sectors (most likely Buildings) is adopted by **2018**  SOCAR sets up an Information Centre for promoting Energy Efficiency (EE) in the Building and Transport sectors by **2018**  Updating of NAMAs registry is started by SOCAR by **2016** | SOCAR’s NAMA action plan/ program developed for implementation of selected, prioritized, and feasible NAMA projects in main oil & gas and end-use subsectors  Market-based financial instruments for financing implementation of NAMA action plan established.  2 major energy management workshops are successfully held.  GHG emission reductions due to pilot project are captured in SOCAR’s GHG Inventory | SOCAR’s NAMA action plan  Review of available financial instruments  Proceedings and minutes from workshops  Review of SOCAR’s Information Centre activities and documents  Review of the NAMA registry |  |
| **Outcome 3:** NAMA pilot projects in SOCAR’s oil & gas and end-use sectors | **Outputs:**  3.1 NAMA pilot 1: SOCAR’s Green Building Program implemented and knowledge about EE practices in buildings is disseminated  3.2 NAMA pilot 2: SOCAR’s Sustainable Transport Initiative implemented resulting in fuel economy in SOCAR’s transportation fleet  3.3 NAMA pilot 3: SOCAR’s associated gas capturing programme implemented (collection and supply of natural gas to meet the heating needs of the area’s inhabitants) | | | | | | |
| Energy-efficiency oriented refurbishments under SOCAR’s “Green Building Programme” |  | Absence of energy efficiency (EE) building standards for new and existing buildings; Lack of availability of green building technologies | Energy audits of 2 existing buildings is completed by 2016  Achievement of 10,500 tCO2eq emission reductions over the 25 year life-time as a result of the pilot investments in building refurbishments starting from 2018    50 persons trained in conducting energy audits by 2017 | Complete energy audits of 3-5 buildings of up to 8,000 m² space (2% of total SOCAR buildings area)  Results of energy savings and GHG reductions (420 tCO2eq) for at least one full year are reported  100 persons trained in design/construction of EE buildings, energy audits and building energy management (both SOCAR and others) | Project documents (energy audits)  GHG emission reduction calculation  Proceedings and minutes from trainings |  |
| New fuel technologies for SOCAR’s vehicle fleet and a sustainable vehicle fleet management system |  | Low penetration rate of alternative fuel systems and state-of-the-art technologies in transportation; Low energy performance of vehicles due to absence of emission and fuel economy standards. | Analytical study developed comparing different fuel technologies, electric vehicles (powered with RE), methanol mixed with gasoline, etc. for modernization of SOCAR’s vehicle fleet (2017)  Achievement of (1,593 tCO2eq) emission reductions over the 10-year life-time (starting in 2019) as a result of the pilot investments in vehicles using alternative fuel sources  Monitoring devices are installed on 10 vehicles by 2018  100 light and 200 heavy vehicles drivers of SOCAR trained on eco-driving practices. | Recommendations of the analytical study are adopted by SOCAR and its implementation is started  Results of energy savings and GHG reductions (160 tCO2eq) for at least one full year are reported  Results from monitoring of vehicles are used to measure fuel consumption/savings pattern  200 light and 500 heavy vehicles drivers of SOCAR trained on eco-driving practices. | Analytical study  Review of the MRV system on GHG emission reductions, NAMA registry  Review of documented SOCARs practices  Proceedings and minutes from trainings |
| Capture and productive use of associated gas |  | Annually, 0.3\*mln t CO2eq is dispersing in atmosphere from Siyazanneft oil-field due to outdated technology; Neighbourhood villages cut forest wood to use for heating | Selection of suitable technologies to capture associated gas and development of a plan for its effective utilization on a pilot basis by 2017  Associated gas technology installation in the oil-field begins in 2017/18  Laying of the pipes and distribution network completed by end of 2018  Direct 550,000 tCO2e emission reductions result over the 25-year lifetime due to the pilot investment  An afforestation programme approved by SOCAR | State of art technologies for associated gas capture are fully adopted by SOCAR for use in other oil-fields  The gas capture equipment including compressors are installed by end of 2018  At least, 600 households/local businesses supplied with clean and safe gas  Results of GHG reductions (22,000 tCO2eq) for at least one full year are reported  The activity results in planting of 1200 trees | Review of project documents, SOCAR practices  Review of the MRV system on GHG emission reductions, NAMA registry  Project and SOCAR reports |
| **Outcome 4**  MRV system and national registry for mitigation actions in the energy generation and end-use sectors developed | **Outputs:**   * 1. Defined and established sectoral and sub-sectoral reference baselines for oil & gas end-use sector sectors   2. Established sub-sectoral GHG inventories for key oil & gas end-use sub-sectors   4.3 Established and operational national registry mechanism for mitigation actions in the oil & gas end-use sectors | | | | | | |
| Regular GHG Inventory conducted |  | Institutional capacity to develop proper GHG inventories is lacking | Updated GHG inventories start becoming available on annual basis by end of 2017 | SOCAR has a fully up-to-date inventories register | GHG inventory |  |
| National registry mechanism for implemented NAMA projects |  | Institutional arrangement to record/report/monitor the outcomes of GHG mitigation activities is missing | National registry is regularly updated with information about NAMAs starting from 2016 | NAMA reporting at national level through a domestic mitigation registry | NAMA register |
| Arrangements for setting and monitoring sector-wide GHG emission reduction targets |  | The concerned entities lack capacity to setup near-and long-term GHG targets | Guidelines are adopted to validate baseline GHG estimates, set future targets, and measure actual emissions (by 2017) | The MRV process is fully functional in SOCAR for monitoring of the progress/outcome of NAMA implementations | MRV documents and review of SOCAR’s procedures |
| Qualified local technical professionals in SOCAR to conduct MRVs |  | Lack of common platform for sharing of expertise among departments involved in data collection, statistical analysis and mitigation planning | Trainings delivered on: Improvement of Statistical database (2016); Sectoral baselines (2017); GHG inventory estimates (2018) | A strong institutional capacity exists in SOCAR in the MRV of implemented NAMAs  12 SOCAR’s experts trained | Review of SOCAR’s procedures  Proceedings and minutes from trainings |
| Dissemination of information about the mitigation measures in energy end-use sectors and MRV framework |  | Low awareness level and information about MRV and national registry systems in GoA | SOCAR trains one high-profile organization in MRV framework development by 2018 | SOCAR trains two organizations in MRV and publishes information on MRV results and experience | Proceedings and minutes from trainings |

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

*Project Identification Form (PIF)*

*UNDP Initiation Plan*

*UNDP Project Document*

*UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results*

*Project Inception Report*

*All Project Implementation Reports (PIR’s)*

*Energy audit reports carried out during pilot activities*

*Progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams*

*MTR Report*

*Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement*

*Minutes of the Project Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)*

*Oversight mission reports*

*All monitoring reports prepared by the project*

*Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team*

*Reports of experts and contractors*

*Field visit and training reports*

*Final products delivered by the companies, digital data, maps, management plans*

*CDRs, Financial documentations as indicated above*

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

*This list will be further detailed with more specific questions by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser.*

| **Evaluation 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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***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[[15]](#footnote-15)**

**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[[16]](#footnote-16)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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[[17]](#footnote-17)) |
| **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[[18]](#footnote-18)) |
| **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. 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-1)
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](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROtI%20Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. This Log-frame is the last version approved after the Mid-Term Evaluation, different from the original version in the Project Document and Inception Report. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. 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-7)
8. The TOR of the international consultant for conducting the TE, which has been annexed to this procurement notice, is an integral part of the scope-of-work of the local consultant. The local consultant will work closely with the international consultant in carrying out all aspects of the tasks that have been highlighted in the attachment. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. 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-9)
10. The term Evaluator signifies both the international and local consultant. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. 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-11)
12. 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-12)
13. The term Evaluator signifies both the international and local consultant. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. This Log-frame is the last version approved after the Mid-Term Evaluation, different from the original version in the Project Document and Inception Report. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. 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-18)