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| **I. Position Information**  |
| **Post Title:** Terminal Evaluation of a “Energy Efficient Production and Utilisation of Charcoal through Innovative Technologies and Private Sector Involvement in Sierra Leone”, PIMS ID: 4904**Location:** Freetown, Sierra Leone**Application Deadline: To be inserted at point of advert****Type of Contract:** Individual(International and National)Consultants **Post Level:** N/A**Duration of Contract:** 20 working days   |
| II. Background |
| UNDP supports countries in addressing development, climate change, and ecosystem sustainability in an integrated manner.  As a Global Environment Facility (GEF) Implementing Agency, UNDP offers countries highly specialized technical services for programme/project formulation, due diligence, mobilization of required co-financing, implementation oversight, results management and evaluation, performance-based payments and knowledge management.In 2014, UNDP-GEF designed a project in Sierra Leone integrate a top-down approach of providing support through policy measures and demand side management through standards, Testing and Certification, in combination with a bottom-up approach of providing financial incentives, carbon finance and market mechanisms to secure supply and create demand for energy efficient charcoal stoves and efficient charcoal kilns. To enhance the effectiveness of these approaches and to create an enabling environment among the stakeholders and value chain actors in the EEPUC project, capacity building and training activities were conducted to enhance the technical and business capacity of the key stakeholders active in the value chain and at the different stages of the project execution. The Energy Efficient Production and Utilisation of Charcoal through Innovative Technologies and Private Sector Involvement in Sierra Leone project was launched in 2015 and is implemented in collaboration with the Ministry of Energy (MOE), Ministry of Agriculture and Forests (MAF), Government Technical Institute (GTI), Westwind Energy, Sierra Leone Environment Protection Agency (SL-EAP) and GIZ in close collaboration with other key stakeholders. The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows: roject Summary Table

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project Title:  | Energy Efficient Production and Utilisation of Charcoal through Innovative Technologies and Private Sector Involvement in Sierra Leone |
| GEF Project ID: | 4840 |   | *at endorsement (US$)* | *at completion (US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | 00090575PIMS 4904 | GEF financing:  | 1,768,182 |       |
| Country: | Sierra Leone | UNDP: | 200,000 |       |
| Region: | Africa | Government: | 500,000 |       |
| Focal Area: | Climate Change | Others | 8,121,585 |       |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): |       | Total co-financing: | 8,821,585 |       |
| Executing Agency: | Ministry of Energy | Total Project Cost: | 10,589,767 |       |
| Other Partners involved: | Ministry of Agriculture and Forests, Government Technical Institute, Westwind Energy, Environment Protection Agency, GIZ Endev | ProDoc Signature (date project began):  | April 24, 2015 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed:December 31 2019 | Actual:December 31 2019 |

The overall goal of this project is Energy Efficient Production and Utilization of Charcoal through Innovative Technologies and Private Sector Involvement in Sierra Leone (EEPUC). The objective of the project is the reduction of GHG emissions in the domestic and industrial sectors of Sierra Leone to bring economic, social and environmental benefits through the production of certified charcoal from sustainably sourced feedstock and through the promotion of efficient charcoal stoves and efficient charcoal kilns to reduce charcoal demand, improve health and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The EEPUC project was designed to have the three components with associated activities and outputs that will lead to the following outcomes.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **EEPUC Project Components** | **Envisaged Outcomes of EEPUC Project**  |
| **Component 1:** Policy and regulatory frameworks on the use of more efficiently produced charcoal and improved cook stoves | **Outcome 1:** Strengthened institutional capacity on biomass resource utilization at the national, regional and community level. Operational effective policy, legal, and regulatory frameworks and review mechanisms on biomass energy technology applications |
| **Component 2:** Development of public-private initiatives for the improved and more efficient production of charcoal and the scaling up of improved cookstove production | **Outcome 2:** Increased number of investments on improved, more efficient charcoal and ICS production in Sierra Leone |
| **Component 3:** Improved, more efficient production and efficient utilization of certified charcoal and cookstove | **Outcome 3:** The production and utilization of certified charcoal and certified improved cook stoves are common practices in Sierra Leone. Enhanced capacity of stakeholder in the value chain (producers, farmers, villagers, women, consumers, collectors) |

The EEPUC project was designed to implement 43 activities and associated outputs to achieve the above outcomes. These 43 activities were grouped under 12 outputs with associated indicators and targets the details of which are available in the final Project Document dated February 2015 and the project logical framework available at Annex A.Implementation of the EEPUC Project is in its final months of implementation (February – March 2020). In accordance with UNDP and GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support and GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference set out the expectations for the terminal evaluation of a “Energy Efficient Production and Utilisation of Charcoal through Innovative Technologies and Private Sector Involvement in Sierra Leone” Project, PIMS ID: 4904. The UNDP therefore requests applications from suitably qualified international and national (Sierra Leonean) candidates to e to conduct the terminal evaluation, in line with the provisions of the terms of references (ToRs), as follows:  |
| **III. Objectives and Scope of Evaluation** |
| 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 UNDP in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The terminal evaluation (TE) will cover implementation of the entire project, since inception in April 2015 to March 2020 and will involve a field mission to Sierra Leone to geographic locations indicated in the next section on evaluation approach and method. The terminal evaluation (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 evaluation will assess the extent to which the project results have been achieved, partnerships established, capacities built, and cross cutting issues of mainstreaming gender, human rights and south-south cooperation have been addressed.  |
|  |
| **IV. Evaluation Approach and Method** |
| An overall approach and method for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects have 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 Freetown, including the following project sites:• Cookstove and Charcoal Development Center (CCDC), Government Technical Institute (GTI), Kissy Docks; Freetown;• Community managed woodlot at Moyamba Junction and Kasewe Forest reserve tree nursery site;• Efficient cookstoves and efficient kilns installed by Westwind Energy and the production facility in Freetown.Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: • Ministry of Energy, • GTI, • Ministry of Agriculture and Forests, • Westwind Energy, • Environment Protection Agency, • GIZ EnDev, • Sierra Leone Standards Bureau• CREEC• Charcoal producers trained by EEPUC project;• Cookstove producers trained by EEPUC project;• Management committee members for woodlots established by EEPUC project. The evaluator(s) will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, mid-term review, progress reports, consultancy reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. The primary and secondary and quantitative and qualitative data for the evaluation are to be collected and scientifically triangulated by the evaluator. The evaluator(s) will also ensure data to be disaggregated by sex, ethnicity, disability, geography as applicable. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator(s) for review is included in [Annex B](#_TOR_Annex_B:) of this Terms of Reference. |
| **V. Evaluation Ethics, Criteria and Ratings** |
| 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)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](#_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: |       |

 |
| **VI. Project Finance / Co-Finance** |
| The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(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  | 200,000 | 165,219 |  |  | 5,889,314 | 0 | 6,089,314 | 165,219 |
| Loans/Concessions  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * In-kind support
 |  |  | 500,000 | 13,600 | 2,232,174 | 5000 | 2,732,174 | 18,600 |
| * Other
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals | 200,000 | 165,219 | 500,000 | 13,600 | 8,121,488 | 5000 | 8,821,488 | 183,819 |

 |
|  |
| **VII. 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 equality.  |
| **VIII. 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.[[1]](#footnote-1)  |
| **IX. Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons** |
| The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions**, **recommendations** and **lessons**. Conclusions should build on findings and be based in evidence. Recommendations should be prioritized, specific, relevant, and targeted, with suggested implementers of the recommendations. Lessons should have wider applicability to other initiatives across the region, the area of intervention, and for the future.  |
| **X. Implementation Arrangements**  |
| The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation will be Team Leader/Acting Team Leader, Environment, Energy and Natural Resource Management Cluster, in the UNDP CO in Sierra Leone. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of logistics, including part payments, in line with contractual deliverables, travel arrangements, etc., 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.  |
| **XI. Evaluation Timeframe**  |
| The total duration of the evaluation will be twenty (20) working day, from date of contract signing, according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Timing** | **Completion Date** |
| **Work Plan Preparation** | 2 days  | 3rd April 2020 |
| **Evaluation Mission** | 10 days  | 17th April 2020 |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | 6 days  | 27th April 2020 |
| **Final Report** | 2 days  | 29th April 2020 |

\*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.  |
| **XII. 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. (3rd April 2020) | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO  |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings  | End of evaluation mission (17th April 2020) | To project management, UNDP CO |
| **Draft Final Report**  | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Within 2 weeks of the evaluation mission (27th April 2020) | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report  | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft (29 April 2020) | 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. |
| **XIII. Team Composition**  |
| The evaluation team will be composed of 1 International and 1 national (Sierra Leone National) evaluators/consultants. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The International Evaluator will be the team leader and be responsible for finalizing the report. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.The Team members must present the following qualifications:* Master’s degree or above in environmental sciences, energy, international development, with specific academic or professional background related to climate change mitigation, monitoring and evaluation or other closely relevant fields (20 points)
* Minimum *7* years of relevant professional experience on environment and climate change mitigation (20 points)
* Knowledge of UNDP and GEF evaluations (15 points)
* Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies (15 points)
* Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s) Climate Change/renewable energy and cooking energy (10 points)
* Experience working in Africa (10 points).
* Fluency in English, both oral and written, is required (10 points).
 |
| **XIV. Application Procedures**  |
| Applicants are requested to apply online (indicate the site, such as http://jobs.undp.org, etc.) by (**to be inserted** **at point of advert).** 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 technical and financial proposals, indicating the methodology and sample evaluation questions they will use to deliver on the assignment and at what 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.  |
| **XV. Payment Modalities and Specifications**  |
| Payment to the consultants will be made in 3 instalments upon satisfactory submission of the following deliverables:* 1st instalment: 10% upon submission of inception report.
* 2nd Instalment: 40% upon submission and approval of draft terminal evaluation report.
* 3rd Instalment: 50% upon submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report.
 |
| **XVI. Evaluation Criteria** |
| **Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer**Combined Scoring method — where the qualifications and methodology will be weighted a maximum of 70% and combined with the price offer which will be weighted a maximum of 30%.**Education: 10%*** Master’s degree or above in environmental sciences, energy, international development, with specific academic or professional background related to climate change mitigation, monitoring and evaluation or other closely relevant fields

**Experience: 15%*** Must have minimum 7 years of relevant professional experience on environment and climate change mitigation
* Must be familiar with state and non-state actors working in the above fields
* Knowledge of UNDP and GEF evaluations

**Clear understanding of the assignment: 10%*** Clear understanding of the assignment as demonstrated in the proposal, overall proposed methodology (comprehensiveness and completeness) time frame, feedback/validation workshop.

*Analytical capabilities 10%** Strategic vision, strong technical and analytical capabilities and demonstrated ability to collect, analyze and interpret data.
* Quantitative and qualitative data management skills
* Competence in the use of collective intelligence will be an advantage

*Interpersonal and communication skills: 5%** Strong interpersonal skills and communication skills,
* Proven ability to work in a team, develop synergies and establish effective working relations within MDAs, with persons of different UN Agencies, government counterparts, donors and NGOs
* Strong written communication skills to produce external communication materials.
* Demonstrated ability to train and build capacity of others

*Integrity 5%** Demonstrates integrity by modelling the UN's values and ethical standards

*Managing complexity 10%** Demonstrates openness to change and ability to receive/integrate feedback;
* Negotiating skills, and the ability to cope with situations which may pose conflict,
* Ability to solve complex problems with minimal supervision
* Ability to work with small multi-disciplinary, multi-national teams to deliver quality products in high stress, short deadline situations.

*Results-orientation 5%** Demonstrated understanding of results-based management.
* Ability to prioritize.
* Use of results language for communication
* Writing and communication will be in English and must have excellent communication skills in English. The consultant must bring his/her own computing equipment.
 |

**Annex A: Project LOGICAL FRAMEWORK**

|  |
| --- |
| **This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD:** By 2018, targeted Government institutions, the private sector, and local communities manage natural resources in a more equitable and sustainable way. |
| **Country Programme Outcome Indicators:****CP Outcome: 3. Access to sustainable energy and livelihoods for remote Chiefdoms (sub-districts/blocks) improved.**UNDP Strategic Plan Environment and Sustainable Development Primary Outcome: Expanding access to environmental and energy services for the poorUNDP Strategic Plan Secondary Outcome: Strengthened national capacities to mainstream environment and energy concerns into national development plans and implementation systems; and Countries develop and use market mechanisms to support environmental management |
| **Expected CPAP Output (s):** 3.1: Adequate policies on renewable energy in place, strong institutional linkages established, and knowledge, awareness and capacities of stakeholders improved (policy makers, financiers, suppliers and end-users);3.2: Effective and affordable renewable/alternative energy technologies for remote Chiefdoms supported through demonstration projects and private sector participation. |
| **Applicable GEF CC-M Focal Area Objective:** Objective 2: Promote market transformation for energy efficiency in industry and the building sector.  |
| **Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:** Outcome 2.2: Sustainable financing and delivery mechanisms established and operational |
| **Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:** Tonnes CO2eq avoided |
|

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Strategy** | **Objectively Verifiable Indicators** | **Source of Verification** | **Critical Assumptions** |
| **Indicators** | **Baseline** | **Targets** |
| **Project Goal: Reduction of GHG emissions in the rural household and industrial sectors of Sierra Leone through integrated and sustainable biomass resource production and utilization, and promotion of sustainable biomass energy technologies in Sierra Leone using market based approaches.** |  Quantity of GHG emissions mitigated annually by End of Project (EOP), tCO2e. |   0 |   Up to 159,668 (68,947+90,721) |    GHG emission mitigation calculations; Statistics reports from DoE; EEPUC project activity and M&E reports |  Recognition of the government on importance of reducing GHG emissions and continuing commitment towards it. |
|   |   |   |   |
|  Total cumulative quantity of GHG emissions mitigated by EOP, tCO2e. |   0 |   Up to 433,568 (275,789 + 157,779) |    Surveys; Statistics reports from DoE; EEPUC project activity and M&E reports |
|  |  |  |   |
|   |  |   |   |
| **Project Objective: Removal of barriers to sustainable production and utilization of biomass resources in Sierra Leone and application of biomass energy technologies to support local economic, environmental and social development that leads to GHG mitigation.**  |  Reduction of fuel wood consumption for energy use in households and industries by EOP, tonnes.  |   0 |   Up to 174,167 |    Household and industry surveys; EEPUC project M&E Reports | Assumptions: |
|  No. of enterprises supplying clean and efficient charcoal by EOP.  |   0 |   At least 1,000 efficient kilns |    Industry surveys; EEPUC project activity and M&E Reports  |   Government continues to have the political will to support policies and actions that would promote clean and efficient stoves and kilns applications |
|  No. of households and industries that adopted, and are benefiting from, the energy-efficient furnaces/stoves by EOP. |   0 |   Up to 15,000 |    Household surveys; EEPUC project activity and M&E Reports  |
|   |   |   |   |   |
|   |  |   |   |   |
| **Component 1: Policy/regulatory frameworks on the use of more efficiently produced charcoal and improved cook stoves** |
| ***Outcome 1: Strengthened institutional capacity on biomass resource utilization at the national, regional and community level. Operational effective policy, legal, and regulatory frameworks and review mechanisms on biomass energy technology applications*** |   No. of sustainable charcoal and improved cookstoves production businesses that were proposed and developed as influenced by the strengthened policy and institutional frameworks for the deployment of stoves and kilns and biomass energy businesses by Year 2 |   0 |   46 improved cookstove and 100 charcoal producers |    Business plans of companies interested in biomass energy production; Industry surveys; EEPUC project activity and M&E reports |   Government continues to see biomass as a priority energy resource to support the country’s sustainable economic development |
|   No. of biomass energy utilization projects that are planned and developed for PURE/SURE purposes by EOP |   0 |   15,0000 improved cookstoves and 1,000 end users |    Documentation of proposed and planned biomass energy supported PURE/SURE projects by the GOT and private sector |
|   No. of policies and legal frameworks that are supportive of BET applications and biomass energy business development approved and enforced by Year 3 |   0 |   1 |    Documentation of new and approved policies and legislations for supporting bioenergy applications |
|   Volume of funding made available for BET application projects by EOP, US$  |   0 |   USD 200,000 (at least) |    Documentation of new and approved policies and legislations for supporting bioenergy applications |
|  No. of relevant government agencies and institutions involved in biomass energy production and are linked with each other via a working mechanism for coordination by EOP. |   0 |   5 |    Documentation of financial agreements for bionergy projects - Surveys; EEPUC project activity and M&E Report |
|  |  |  |    Documentation of Government memos and MOU on the collaborative work on BET promotion activities |
|   |  |  |  |
| **Component 2: Development of public-private initiatives for the improved and more efficient production of charcoal and the scaling up of improved cookstove production** |
| ***Outcome 2: Increased number of investments on improved, more efficient charcoal and ICS production in Sierra Leone*** |   No. of improved cook stoves produced (ICS) by Year 4 |   0 |   15,000 |    Surveys; EEPUC project activity and M&E reports |  |
|   No. of ICS bought and utilized by consumers annually starting Year 4 |   0 |   15,000 |    Surveys; EEPUC project activity and M&E reports |
|  No. of installed efficient charcoal kilns that are operational by EOP. |   0 |   1,000 |    Surveys; EEPUC project activity and M&E reports |
|   No. of institutional furnaces/stoves installed & being used on a daily basis by households in targeted areas by EOP |   0 |   700 |    Surveys; EEPUC project activity and M&E reports |
|  No. of industrial stoves installed and are operational by EOP. |   0 |   300 |    Surveys; EEPUC project activity and M&E reports |
|   Total volume of investments on biomass energy technology applications by EOP, US$ million |   0 |   USD 500,000 |    Survey of FIs; EEPUC project activity and M&E reports |
| **Component 3: Improved, more efficient production and efficient utilization of certified charcoal and cookstove** |
| ***Outcome 3.1:The production and utilization of certified charcoal and certified improved cook stoves are common practices in Sierra Leone***  |   No. of new proposed and planned project developments that replicates successfully operating stoves and kilns application projects by Year 4 |   0 |   3 |    Documentation of project plans; EEPUC project activity and M&E reports |   |
|   No. of stoves and kilns replication projects that are approved and for implementation by Year 4 |   0 |   3 |    Documentation of approved project plans; EEPUC project activity and M&E reports |
|   No. of completed stoves and kilns replication projects by EOP |   0 |   3 |    Reports on the performance of replication projects; EEPUC project activity and M&E reports |
|  |  |  |  |
| ***Outcome 3.2 Enhanced capacity of stakeholder in the value chain (producers, farmers, villagers, women, consumers, collectors)*** |   No. of local manufacturing firms that can fabricate and install equipment/components used in stoves and kilns systems by Year 4 |   1 |   146 |    Company profile of qualified local manufacturing firms fabricating and installing bioenergy system equipment and components |  |
|   No. of trained and qualified men and women technicians working on stoves and kilns application projects by EOP |   0 |   3,000 champions |    Company profile of qualified local engineering firms working on bioenergy application projects; job certifications of technical staff |
|  |  |  |    Company profile of qualified local technical services firms doing R&M work on bioenergy system facilities; job certifications of technical staff |
|   No. of local development plans that integrate biomass energy use, stoves and kiln applications, and biomass industry development prepared by local government men and women planners by EOP |   0 |   5 |    Company profile of local firms working on sustainable forestry projects; job certifications of technical staff |
|   No. of local men and women financial officers that are capable of evaluating biomass energy and other RE project proposals by EOP |   0 |   15 |    Documentation on local development plans in selected towns |
|   No. of local entrepreneurs and SMEs that are gainfully involved in businesses that make up the value chain of the bioenergy application industry by EOP  |   0 |   25 |    Profile of banks/FIs with RE project loan portfolios; job certifications of technical staff |
|  |  |  |    Survey of companies involved in the upstream and downstream activities in the bioenergy application industry |

 |

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

*• UNDP Project Document*

*• Project Log-frame Analysis (LFA)*

*• Project Implementation Plan*

*• Implementing/ Executing partner arrangements*

*• List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Board, and other partners to be consulted*

*• Project Inception Report*

*• PPRs*

*• Project MTR Report*

*• Project MTR Management Response*

*• Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams*

*• Project budgets and financial data*

*• Audit reports*

*• Oversight mission reports*

*• All monitoring reports prepared by the project*

*• Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team*

*• Project Board Meeting minutes*

*• Project Tracking Tool, at baseline, at mid-term, and at terminal points*

*• UNDP Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)*

*• UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)*

*• UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)*

*• Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems*

*• UNDP country/countries programme document(s)*

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

*• Guidance for conducting terminal evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed project*

*• EEPUC Project Document dated February 2014;*

*• LPAC Minutes of EEPUC Project, February 2014;*

*• EEPUC Project, Inception Workshop Report, February, 2015*

*• Quarterly and Annual Progress Reports of EEPUC project from 2014 to 2019;*

*• Project Steering Committee Minutes during 2014-2019;*

*• Finalised GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement, mid-term and terminal stages;*

*• Audit reports, observations and management responses on the EEPUC project during 2015-2019;*

*• Statistics Sierra Leone, 2013 Survey of Charcoal Businesses in Urban Centres of Sierra Leone;*

*• GoSL, 2016, Renewable Energy Policy of Sierra Leone;*

*• GoSL, 2016, Energy Efficiency Policy of Sierra Leone;*

*• UNDP/TEJ CAIE, 2017, Market Survey on Improved Cook Stoves;*

*• UNDP/Maccarthy, R, 2017, Consultancy Report on Gender Analysis and Training;*

*• UNDP,2017, Conteh, AAF, Technical support for community-based climate-smart agroforestry and woodlots interventions in Sierra Leone*

*• UNDP/GoSL, 2017, National Energy Policy and Strategic Plan;*

*• UNDP/GoSL, 2017, Bioenergy Policy;*

*• UNDP/GoSL, 2017, Energy Bill Drafting Guidelines;*

*• UNDP/Rijal and Momoh, 2018, Report of the Mid-term Review: Energy Efficient Production and Utilisation of Charcoal through Innovative Technologies and Private Sector Involvement in Sierra Leone;*

*• UNDP/GEF, 2019, 2019 Project Implementation Review (PIR): Sierra Leone Charcoal;*

*• UNDP/GTI, 2019, Report on the workshops and Training for the Production of Efficient and Sustainable Charcoal production in Sierra Leone*

*• EPA/UNDP/Kargbo, 2019, Climate Change Financing Framework (CCFF) for Sierra Leone;*

*• GIZ/EnDev/Kuerten, Y, 2018, Report of Testing of Wonder Stoves;*

*• UNDP/Westwind Energy, 2019, Training Module for the Fabrication of Fuel Efficient Cookstoves Supported by UNDP/GEF EEPUC Project;*

*• Statistics Sierra Leone, 2019, Sierra Leone Integrated Household Survey (SLIHS) Report 2018;*

*• Kiwana, D, 2019, Final Report of Installation of Cookstove Testing Equipment and Training at the Government Technical Institute, Freetown, Sierra Leone;*

*• GIZ EnDev/M Temmerman, Charcoal Production in Sierra Leone, 2019, GIZ EnDev;*

*• UNDP/ECREEE/GoSL, 2019, Sierra Leone Clean Cooking Action Plan.*

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

This Evaluation Criteria Matrix must be fully completed/amended by the consultant and included in the TE inception report and as an Annex to the TE report.

| **Evaluative Criteria Questions** | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Annex D: Rating Scales

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Ratings for Effectiveness, Efficiency, Overall Project Outcome Rating, M&E, IA & EA Execution:*** | ***Sustainability ratings:***  | ***Relevance ratings:*** |
| 6. Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5. Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings4. Moderately Satisfactory (MS): moderate shortcomings3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings2. Unsatisfactory (U): major shortcomings1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings | 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 risks1. Unlikely (U): severe risks |  |
| *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[[2]](#footnote-2)**

**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[[3]](#footnote-3)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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[[4]](#footnote-4)) |
| **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[[5]](#footnote-5))  |
| **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 (\*), implementation (\*), and overall assessment (\*)
* Implementing Agency (UNDP) execution (\*) and Executing Agency execution (\*), overall project implementation/ execution (\*), coordination, and operational issues
 |
| **3.3** | Project Results* Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*)
* Relevance (\*)
* Effectiveness (\*)
* Efficiency (\*)
* Country ownership
* Mainstreaming
* Sustainability: financial resources (\*), socio-economic (\*), institutional framework and governance (\*), environmental (\*), and overall likelihood (\*)
* 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
* Report Clearance Form
* *Annexed in a separate file:* TE audit trail
* *Annexed in a separate file:* Terminal GEF Tracking Tool, if applicable
 |

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** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**Prepared by:**

**Project Manager, EEPUC:** Andrew Katta \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Reviewed by:**

**Team Lead, SLED Cluster:** Tanzila Sankoh \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Approved by:**

**DRR Operations/Programmes:** Rokya Ye Dieng: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. 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-1)
2. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. See Annex D for rating scales. See UNDP-GEF TE Guidance section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)