



INDIVIDUAL PROCUREMENT NOTICE

Date: 22 March 2020

Country: Cairo, Egypt

Description of the assignment: UNDP-GEF Terminal Evaluation International Consultant for Egypt for (PIMS #2284)

Project name: Bioenergy for Sustainable Rural Development Project

Assignment: Terminal Evaluation (TE)

Period of assignment/services (if applicable): 22 working days

Proposal should be submitted at the following email address to: Procurementnotice.egypt@undp.org no later than **April 9, 2020**.

Any request for clarification must be sent in writing, or by standard electronic communication to the address or e-mail indicated above. The procurement unit will respond in writing or by standard electronic mail and will send written copies of the response, including an explanation of the query without identifying the source of inquiry, to all consultants.

1. BACKGROUND

The project was designed to: facilitate and accelerate the market development for new bioenergy technologies (BET) in Egypt, thereby promoting sustainable socio-economic development of the rural communities in Egypt and reducing the negative global and local environmental impacts associated with the use of fossil fuels and the environmentally not sound management of the agricultural waste.

The objective of the project is to remove the technical, institutional, information, financial, and market barriers to developing the BET market in Egypt by (i) testing the feasibility and building the public confidence on BET systems and on the new business and financing models to facilitate their broader adoption, and on the basis of those models showing success, developing further the financial, institutional and market strategies for their large-scale replication; (ii) supporting the development and adoption of an enabling policy framework to implement and leverage financing for the recommended strategies; iii) building the capacity of the supply side to do marketing, finance and deliver rural bioenergy services; and iv) institutionalizing the support provided by the project to facilitate sustainable growth of the market after the end of the project.

2. MAIN OBJECTIVES, RESPONSIBILITIES AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ANALYTICAL WORK.

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.

2. SCOPE OF WORK, RESPONSIBILITIES AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ANALYTICAL WORK

As Per attached TOR – Annex 1

3. REQUIREMENTS FOR EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS

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

Education:

- Advanced university degree in Biological Science, Economics, Sustainable Development, or related discipline **(10%)**

Experience:

- Minimum 7 years of relevant professional experience in the area of biodiversity and ecosystem **(15%)**
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF **(10%)**
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies; **(20%)**
- Good communication and analytical skills **(5%)**
- Good command of English language, both written and spoken
- Previous work experience in the region is an asset **(5%)**
- Previous experience with gender-sensitive analysis **(5%)**

Competencies:

Job Knowledge & Expertise:

- Excellent organizational skills and ability to handle effectively multiple tasks without compromising quality, team spirit and positive working relationships with all colleagues;
- Dependability, reliability and initiative;
- Is motivated & demonstrates a capacity to pursue personal development & learning.

Results-Orientation:

- Plans and produces quality results to meet established goals.

People Skills:

- Sets clear performance goals and standards; executes responsibilities accordingly.
- Partnering & Networking:
- Seeks and applies knowledge, information, and best practices from within and outside UN.

Innovation & Judgment:

- Contributes creative, practical ideas and approaches to deal with challenging situations;
- Pursues own personal and professional development;
- Strives for quality client-centered services (internal/external).

Language Requirements:

Proficiency in English or Arabic Languages are essential.

4. DOCUMENTS TO BE INCLUDED WHEN SUBMITTING THE PROPOSALS.

- ◆ Applicants are requested to apply no later than **April 9, 2020**. Individual consultants are invited to submit their applications together with an updated P11 form for this position either online (on UNDP website) or by email to the Procurement Unit, Procurementnotice.egypt@undp.org.
- ◆ The application should contain a current and complete **Personal History Form (P11 form¹)** in English including the e-mail and phone contact, together with a **financial offer** including a lumpsum for the fees excluding the travel costs that will be covered as per UNDP rules and regulations.
- ◆ 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.

5. FINANCIAL PROPOSAL*** Contracts based on daily fee**

The financial proposal will specify the daily fee, travel expenses and per diems quoted in separate line items, and payments are made to the Individual Consultant based on the number of days worked.

*** Travel**

All envisaged travel costs must be included in the financial proposal. This includes all travel to join duty station/repatriation travel. In general, UNDP should not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket. Should the IC wish to travel on a higher class he/she should do so using their own resources.

In the case of unforeseeable travel, payment of travel costs including tickets, lodging and terminal expenses should be agreed upon, between the respective business unit and Individual Consultant, prior to travel and will be reimbursed.

6. EVALUATION

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on the following methodology:

Cumulative analysis

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

- a) responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
- b) Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

* Technical Criteria weight; [70%]

* Financial Criteria weight; [30%]

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of **70 point** would be considered for the Financial Evaluation

Criteria	Weight
<u>Technical</u>	70%
Advanced university degree in Biological Science, Economics, Sustainable Development, or related discipline	10%
Minimum 7 years of relevant professional experience in the area of biodiversity and ecosystem	15%
Knowledge of UNDP and GEF	10%
Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;	20%
Good communication and analytical skills	5%
Previous work experience in the region is an asset	5%
Previous experience with gender-sensitive analysis	5%
Total Technical	70%
<u>Financial</u>	30%
Total	100%

ANNEX

ANNEX 1- TERMS OF REFERENCES (TOR)

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 **Bioenergy for Sustainable Rural Development Project (PIMS #2284)**

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Bioenergy for Sustainable Rural Development Project			
GEF Project ID:	1335		<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Project Atlas Award ID:	2284 00045899	GEF financing:		3,000,000
Atlas Output ID:	00054347			
Country:	Egypt	Private sector:		250,000
Region:	Arab States	Government:		1,760,000
Focal Area:	E&E	Other:		150,000
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:		
Executing Agency:	Ministry of State for Environmental Affairs Agency	Total Project Cost:		US\$ 5,160,000.00
Other Partners involved:		ProDoc Signature (date project began):		19 November 2008
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 2007-2011	Actual: 2008-2020

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to: facilitate and accelerate the market development for new bioenergy technologies (BET) in Egypt, thereby promoting sustainable socio-economic development of the rural communities in Egypt and reducing the negative global and local environmental impacts associated with the use of fossil fuels and the environmentally not sound management of the agricultural waste.

The objective of the project is to remove the technical, institutional, information, financial, and market barriers to developing the BET market in Egypt by (i) testing the feasibility and building the public confidence on BET systems and

on the new business and financing models to facilitate their broader adoption, and on the basis of those models showing success, developing further the financial, institutional and market strategies for their large-scale replication; (ii) supporting the development and adoption of an enabling policy framework to implement and leverage financing for the recommended strategies; iii) building the capacity of the supply side to do marketing, finance and deliver rural bioenergy services; and iv) institutionalizing the support provided by the project to facilitate sustainable growth of the market after the end of the project.

In order to facilitate sustainable market transformation, there is a need for parallel, mutually supportive measures that can create a sustainable demand through an enabling policy framework and other promotional measures, which are building the confidence of the market on the new technologies, and on the other side meeting this demand by building the capacity of commercially oriented and professional supply chain able to offer high quality products and services, combined with the access to affordable and sustainable financing mechanisms.

Through the implementation of the planned investments projects, the project is going to monitor and collect experiences from the different type and size of bioenergy applications, including family, community and farm scale, thereby exploring further the opportunities also for semi-industrial or industrial plants. For this purpose and in line with the recommendations coming out from the GEF Council review, more advanced technologies also from other countries will be evaluated in addition to the proposed lower costs technologies from China and India.

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

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

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method¹ for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**, as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (*fill in Annex C*). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, 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 **Egypt**, including the following project sites in **Assiut and Fayoum governorates**. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

key stakeholders:

- The Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency (Ministry of Environment)
- United Nations Development Programme, Egypt Country Office

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

- Local government (governorates),
- Civil society
- Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises Development Agency, (MSMEDA)
- New and Renewable Energy Authority (NREA) of the Ministry of Electricity
- Agricultural Research Center (ARC)
- Private Sector

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](#) of this Terms of Reference.

EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

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

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	<i>rating</i>	2. IA& EA Execution	<i>rating</i>
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	
3. Assessment of Outcomes	<i>rating</i>	4. Sustainability	<i>rating</i>
Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental:	
		Overall likelihood of sustainability:	

PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

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

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

MAINSTREAMING

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

IMPACT

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

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

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

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Egypt. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of Daily Subsistence Allowance 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 **22** days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	4 days	<i>3 May 2020</i>
Evaluation Mission	7 days	<i>3 June 2020</i>
Draft Evaluation Report	9 days	<i>30 June 2020</i>
Final Report	2 days	<i>Mid-July 2020</i>

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

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission. <i>14 May 2020</i>	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission <i>9 June 2020</i>	To project management, UNDP CO
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission <i>30 June 2020</i>	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft <i>Mid-July 2020</i>	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

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

TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of one international evaluator. The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar biodiversity projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluator 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:

- Advanced university degree in a subject related to engineering, natural resources management, development or other relevant field;
- Minimum 8 years of relevant professional experience in the area of renewable energy, bio-energy technologies, rural energy, and energy policy
- Experience in environmental policy implementation and familiarity with climate change mitigation activities;
- Previous experience in evaluation for international development agencies, preferably for UN and/or GEF projects;
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Familiarity with issues related to UNFCCC;
- Conceptual thinking and analytical skills;
- Excellent English communication skills; Strong writing and analytical skills coupled with experience in monitoring and evaluation techniques;
- Previous involvement in and understanding of UNDP and GEF procedures is an advantage and extensive international experience in the fields of project formulation, execution, and evaluation is an asset;
- Previous experience with gender-sensitive analysis.

EVALUATOR ETHICS

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

PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

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

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

APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to apply no later than **9 April 2020**. Individual consultants are invited to submit their applications together with an updated P11 form for this position either online (on UNDP website) or by email to the Procurement Unit, Procurementnotice.egypt@undp.org.

The application should contain a current and complete **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](#)³) in English including the e-mail and phone contact, together with a **financial offer** including a lumpsum for the fees excluding the travel costs that will be covered as per UNDP rules and regulations.

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.

³ http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

1. ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

<p>Project Goal: To facilitate and accelerate the market development of new bioenergy technologies (BET) in Egypt, thereby promoting the sustainable socio-economic development of the rural communities in Egypt and reducing the negative global and local environmental impacts associated with the use of fossil fuels and the environmentally not sound management of the agricultural and solid waste.</p>					
Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<p>Objective of the project: To remove the technical, institutional, information, financial, and market barriers to developing the bioenergy technology (BET) market in Egypt</p>	<p>The level of confidence on modern BET as means to contribute to rural energy needs.</p> <p>The market growth of BET</p> <p>The level of supportive framework conditions in place sustaining the market growth after the end of the GEF project.</p>	<p>Low level of confidence</p> <p>No market growth of BET</p> <p>Inadequate public support to the initiate and sustain the BET market growth</p>	<p>High level of confidence</p> <p>Average annual 20% market growth at the end of the project, as compared to the previous year.</p> <p>Supportive policy, including required financial and fiscal incentives in place to sustain the market growth.</p>	<p>Final project evaluation and the related stakeholder consultations.</p>	<p>The political will to effectively promote bioenergy as an alternative or complementary energy source to LPG, kerosene and diesel.</p>
<p>Outcome 1: New business and financing models successfully introduced using appropriate technical solutions and demonstrating the possibility to construct and operate BET systems on a</p>	<p>The level of confidence on modern BET and the implementation mechanisms promoted.</p> <p>The operational and financial data of the systems installed.</p> <p>The level of customer</p>	<p>Low level of awareness and confidence - only some family scale systems installed – lack of success stories on a broader scale.</p>	<p>At least 1000 family scale, 10 community scale and 2 farm scale biogas systems constructed and commissioned by the end of the project.</p> <p>For gasification and/or combustion plants, at least 4 MW of installed new</p>	<p>Project reports</p> <p>Project midterm and final evaluation, including related surveys.</p>	<p>The targeted beneficiaries accept the proposed technologies, implementation and financing arrangements.</p>

cost recovery basis under a supportive and enabling policy and financing environment.	satisfaction.		capacity reached by the end of the project. Over 90% of the customers satisfied with the new systems		
Output 1.1 An updated market analysis and finalized plans and operational criteria for the project's capacity building and financial support strategy.	Finalized, updated market analysis, plans and operational criteria for the project's capacity building and financial support strategy.	The market analysis plans and operational criteria for the project's capacity building and financial support strategy to be finalized.	See the indicator.	Project reports	Approval of the project by the GEF
Output 1.2 The initial awareness raising and marketing with the targeted clients successfully finalized (for replication the awareness raising and marketing under Outcome 3).	Number of applications received	Lack of awareness of the existing opportunities with bioenergy	The applications for support to reach the first-year targets, i.e. 50 family scale biogas plants and 2 community scale biogas plants received	Project reports	The targeted beneficiaries accept the proposed technologies, implementation and financing arrangements.
Output 1.3 The Bioenergy Development Fund successfully announced and launched.	Number of and approved	No financial support facility or scheme exist to support BETs	The applications for support to reach the first-year targets, i.e. 50 family scale biogas plants and 2 community scale biogas plants approved.	Project reports	See above.
Output 1.4 The BET systems installed as per the project annual and final targets.	Number of systems constructed.	No systems constructed	The first pilot bioenergy systems constructed and operated by professional "Bioenergy Service Providers" on the basis of maximum cost recovery by the end of the first 18 months of project implementation	Project reports	See above

			Others as per the project's annual and final targets.		
<p>Outcome 2 An enabling policy framework, effectively promoting rural bioenergy development adopted.</p>	<p>The content of the policy actions, legal and regulatory changes adopted.</p>	<p>Subsidized fossil fuel and electricity prices.</p> <p>Lack of supportive policies to create a level playing field for BETs.</p> <p>Lack of adequate product standards and quality control mechanisms</p>	<p>An enabling policy framework for promoting sustainable rural biomass energy adopted, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognition of the BET and other renewable systems in official Gov't documents as the first option to be studied and considered for meeting rural energy needs, whenever technically and economically feasible • A level playing field for BET systems to compete with subsidized fossil fuels created and, as applicable, introduction of eventual additional financial or fiscal incentives to support BETs on the basis of their socio-economic and environmental benefits • A supportive regulatory framework for managing the relations between the bioenergy service providers and the customers; 	<p>Project reports and official Government documents</p>	<p>The political will to effectively promote bioenergy as an alternative or complementary energy source to LPG, kerosene and diesel exist, including the provision of adequate financial and fiscal incentives.</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adoption of adequate product standards and quality control mechanisms. 		
Output 2.1 <i>An updated study on the technical, economic and financial feasibility of the different bioenergy technologies for contributing to sustainable management of agricultural waste and its use for productive energy generation purposes.</i>	The status of the study	No updated assessment available	The study finalized by the end of the first year of the project.	Project reports	
Output 2.2 <i>Enhanced awareness of and established policy dialogue with the key stakeholders and decision makers on the results of the study and the socio-economic benefits of BET systems.</i>	<p>The PR material produced</p> <p>The list and output of consultations held.</p>	Inadequate awareness and attention on the socio-economic benefits of BET systems.	<p>The initial PR package finalized</p> <p>Initial meetings and consultations with the key stakeholders finalized by the first 12 months of the project.</p> <p>Enhanced awareness of the general public through programs and articles in public media, workshops etc.</p>	Project reports	Consistency with the overall Government strategies and development priorities
Output 2.3 <i>A draft policy paper highlighting the barriers and recommending improvements for the current policy framework for the development of the rural bio-energy market.</i>	The status of the document	No comprehensive proposal on the steps to be taken for creating an enabling policy framework for biomass energy.	The draft policy paper finalized by the end of the first 18 months from the project start.	Project reports	See above
Output 2.4 <i>Continuing consultations, promotional events, high-level meetings</i>	The status and level of policy dialogue	Inadequate attention on the legal and regulatory changes needed to	The required activities to facilitate the adoption of the recommended policy	Project reports	See above

and other measures to facilitate the adoption of the recommendations.		effectively promote BETs.	changes finalized by the end of the second year of the project.		
Outcome 3 Enhanced capacity of the local supply chain to market and deliver sustainable rural bioenergy products and services, including financing.	The number of identified and trained "Bioenergy Service Providers" (BSPs) capacitated to continue to operate on a self-sustaining basis after the end of the project. The level of follow-up activities of the trained BSPs.	Inadequate capacity of the supply chain to effectively market and deliver products and services for rural bioenergy development.	At least 20 new local entities to serve as BSPs identified and their capacity built by the end of the first 18 months. The follow-up activities and business of the trained BSPs show an increasing trend, leveraging financing from a variety of sources.	Market surveys and monitoring reports Project mid-term and final evaluation	Adequate demand for rural bioenergy services can be created through the project. Interest of the targeted stakeholders to extend or expand their business in the bioenergy field.
Output 3.1 An updated survey and evaluation of the existing (or potential future) market players and their capacity to produce rural biomass energy related products and services.	The status of the survey.	No updated survey exists.	An updated survey and capacity evaluation finalized by the end of the first 6 months of the project.	Project reports	Enough entities with initial capacity and interest to grow into professional BSPs exist.
Output 3.2 Channels and opportunities for information exchange, networking, match making missions and conditions for different local and foreign entities to explore opportunities for co-operation created	Number of contacts facilitated	Good channels and opportunities for networking and matchmaking between the local supply side actors and potential foreign partners missing.	Project web site established including links to relevant information. At least one international, bioenergy workshop in Egypt and 5 matchmaking missions facilitated by the project.	Project reports	See above
Output 3.3 A manual for the development and financing of rural bioenergy projects in Egypt	The status of manual	No manual available	Finalized manual in Arabic and in English for developing and financing of rural bioenergy projects in Egypt.	Project reports	See above

Output 3.4 An information and marketing package tailored for the targeted co-financing sources to support the BSPs and related awareness raising / match making finalized	The availability of the information and marketing package. The number of meeting and financial matchmaking events organized	No consolidated information about BET systems to potential financing institutions available.	Information and marketing package about BET systems to potential financing institutions finalized. Contacts created between the BSPs and with at least 5 new promising co- financing sources in addition to the BDF.	Project reports	See above
Output 3.5 Draft technical standards and certification system (to be adopted either as a voluntary or as a mandatory quality control scheme – see outcome 2).	The status of the technical standards/ requirements and a certification system	No technical standards or certification system in place	Technical standards or requirements and a certification system developed and adopted (see also outcome 2) both for hardware and for service providers in the distribution chain.	Project reports	Adequate market volume to justify the certification system.
Output 3.6 Trained and, as applicable, certified product and service providers, including manufacturers, technicians etc.	Number and type of people trained Verified results of the training through a certification scheme	Lack of information and capacity in the supply chain to effectively market and deliver their products and services.	At least 100 people trained and, as applicable, certified from the supply chain in order to build up their technical, management and marketing, plant operation and maintenance and/or financial engineering skills (the scope of training depending on the target group)	Project reports	Interest and motivation of the targeted stakeholders for training can be created through perspective business opportunities, the introduction of the certification system or by other means.
Output 3.7 A joint public awareness raising and marketing campaign with supply side product or service providers for the targeted customers	The number of customers reached by the marketing campaigns Optional: Number of partnerships created and, as applicable, the amount of cost-sharing	No comprehensive marketing campaigns implemented.	Over 50% percent of the targeted clients (the specific amount t.b.d) are acknowledging the information delivered through the marketing campaigns.	Market surveys	Interest of the targeted product and service providers to join the campaign.

	received.				
Outcome 4 Institutionalization of the support provided by the project, including monitoring, learning, adaptive feedback and evaluation.	An entity continuing the bioenergy market promotion after the project established and its funding secured The level of information available for adaptive management, for measuring the impact and for effective replication/ expansion of the project activities.	Discontinuing support at the end of the project. Inadequate information for measuring the impact and for adaptive management.	An entity continuing the bioenergy market promotion after the project established and its funding secured Required information available during the implementation of the project for adaptive management, for measuring the impact and for effective replication/ expansion of the project activities.	Project final evaluation Annual project reports	Successful completion of the prior project activities
Output 4.1 An updated baseline study, against which the impact of the project can be measured.	Status of the report.	Inadequate or outdated baseline information.	Finalized, updated baseline study.	Project reports	Selection of the right tools and methodologies for the baseline study and for monitoring the project impact.
Output 4.2 Project mid-term evaluation and other required reviews, including annual reports from continuing monitoring and evaluation of all the investment projects facilitated by the project	Status of the reports	Inadequate information for adaptive management.	Finalized mid-term evaluation and adequate management response to address the MTE observations and recommendations.	Project reports	Adequate monitoring, reporting and filing of the key documents to facilitate external reviews and evaluations.
Output 4.3 Adding the topic of rural biomass energy increasingly into the	The level of inclusion of bioenergy into the relevant curricula's	Bioenergy inadequately covered by the current curricula's	Rural biomass energy increasingly included into the curricula of the relevant	Project reports and final evaluation	See above

curricula of the relevant academic and other educational institutions			academic and other educational institutions		
Output 4.4 A Biomass Energy Association or another applicable entity continue to serve as a focal point for further promotional activities on a self-sustaining basis.	The existence and continuing effective operation of a bioenergy focal point after the project	No focal point for rural bioenergy available after the project	A rural bioenergy focal point established and continue its effective operation also after the project	Final evaluation	See above
Output 4.5 As needed, further elaboration and financing leveraged for applicable financial support mechanisms to continue the promotion of bioenergy, including, as applicable, carbon financing	The continuing availability of the required financial support, when needed.	The existing financing barriers continue to slow down the rural bioenergy development	Established financial support mechanisms continue to attract financing for bio-energy projects at the end of the project as per the market development targets set at the project objective level.	Final evaluation	See above
Output 4.6 Final project report consolidating the results and lesson learnt from the implementation of the different project components and recommendations for the required next steps.	Status of the final report	No consolidation of the results and lessons learnt.	Final project report consolidating the results and lesson learnt from the implementation of the different project component and recommendations for the required next steps.	Project reports and final evaluation	Continuing monitoring and reporting of the impact of the pilot projects by using the rights tools and methodologies as well as the experiences and lessons learnt during their implementation.
Output 4.7 Final project evaluation.	Status of the FE	No FE	Final evaluation finalized as per the specific UNDP and GEF requirements	Project reports	Adequate monitoring, reporting and filing of the key documents to facilitate external reviews and evaluations.

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

1. Project document
2. Annual Project Review (APR)/Project Implementation Report (PIR)
3. Mid Term Evaluation Report
4. Project Technical Reports
5. Project financial budgets
6. Project brochures and awareness materials

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

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

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the challenges that the project was meant to address at its initiation. • How the project approach was able to set the links between global and national benefits • How would you assess the national ownership of the project • How relevant is the project to: development priorities of Egypt - UNDP thematic areas • How did the project approach contribute to GHG emission reduction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project document • Stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Literature review • Interviews
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the project status with respect to target outputs in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness? What factors impeded or facilitated the production of such outputs • How useful are the outputs to the needs of the direct beneficiaries. Is there a general acceptance of the outputs by these beneficiaries. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PIRs • Stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Literature review • Interviews
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How well did the project use its resources to produce target outputs • To what extent are local expertise (by gender) and indigenous technologies and resources used • How did the project has selected the consultants and contractors who supported the project implementation • What are the areas that needed international consultants/contractors and why? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PMU 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews

Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have a mechanism been put in place to ensure the sustainability of the project results. • How has the project contributed to the development of the capacity of the direct beneficiaries to carry out their tasks in an environment of change in terms, a). individual learning, by gender, and b). improving organizational structures and interrelationships? • What are the likely impacts of the project beyond the direct beneficiaries? • Are there any signs of potential contribution to enabling environment or to a broader development context (ie. Institutional, socio-political, economic and environmental)? • Are the project results systematically disseminated? 	•	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PIRs • Stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there any plans to replicate and upscale the pilot projects 	•	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

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

ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

Evaluators:

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

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form⁴

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: _____

⁴www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINES

- 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 Manual⁶)
- 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 rated⁷)
- 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

⁵The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁶ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

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.

- 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: _____

ANNEX H: TE REPORT AUDIT TRAIL

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

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

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

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