

# Terms of Reference

## Consultancy for UNDP-GEF Midterm Review Derisking Renewable Energy NAMA for the Nigerian Power Sector

**Location:** Nigeria  
**Application Deadline:** 7<sup>th</sup> December, 2018  
**Category:** DREI  
**Type of Contract:** 2 Individual Contracts  
**Assignment Type:** International & Local Consultant  
**Languages Required:** English  
**Starting Date:** 15 January 2019  
**Duration of Initial Contract:** 21 days  
**Expected Duration of Assignment:** 3months

### 1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized project titled Derisking Renewable Energy NAMA for the Nigerian Power Sector (PIMS # 5243) implemented through the Energy Commission of Nigeria (ECN), which is to be undertaken in Q1 2019. The project started on 28<sup>th</sup> June 2016 and is in its second year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated before the submission of the second Project Implementation Report (PIR). This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects (<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guidance.shtml#gef>).

### 2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The Derisking Renewable Energy NAMA for the Nigerian Power Sector was designed to support the Government of Nigeria to develop a Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Action (NAMA) for the Nigerian Power Sector. The NAMA will target solar PV primarily to achieve a transformation in the electricity mix such that at least 20GW of Nigeria's electricity is generated from solar PV by 2030. The NAMA design will use a rigorous quantitative methodology based on UNDP's Derisking ("DREI") methodology. The project will build upon existing national development policies and initiatives that seek to put in place public derisking instruments to support the more efficient and effective participation of the private sector in the power sector. The project will develop the NAMA architecture and enabling conditions through a combination of complementary policy and financial derisking instruments, which will be validated through the implementation of a 100 MW PV project. The project will contribute to the country's attainment of its voluntary mitigation targets in the energy sector, with expected direct emission reductions of 205,700 tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>e during the project's lifetime and additional indirect emission reductions of between 6.79 and 9.72 million tCO<sub>2</sub>e. Being the first of its kind, the baseline project will also pave the way for catalyzing more private investments so that the NAMA will generate national benefits related to green growth, energy security and job creation at scale. To achieve this, the project has been divided into three main components:

**Component 1:** Design and development of a power sector renewable energy NAMA supported by DREI analysis,  
**Component 2:** Policy and institutional framework for private investment in on-grid renewable power generation,  
**Component 3:** First commercial on-grid RE project.

The following outcomes are expected from the project:

- Policy and Financial De-risking Instruments assessed using DREI analysis based on Solar PV (Catalyzing private sector investment)
- Public instruments developed and implemented for derisking the national policy environment:
- The Nigeria Power Sector RE NAMA Operationalized by demonstrating a proof-of-concept grid-connected solar PV plant with quantified GHG emission reductions.

The project duration is 5 years starting from June 28, 2016 and ending June 28, 2021 with an overall GEF budget of US \$ 4,400,000 and co-financed by UNDP US\$1,500,000, National Government (in-kind) 2,050,000, Private Sector US\$ 210,000,000 total budget US\$ 217,950,000. The project is nationally implemented (NIM) by the Energy Commission of Nigeria with UNDP Country office support.

### 3. OBJECTIVES OF THE MTR

The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project's strategy, its risks to sustainability

#### 4. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The MTR must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR team will review the baseline GEF focal area Tracking Tool submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tool that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins. The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders. Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to the Project Steering Committee members, and the Energy Commission of Nigeria (ECN), Federal Ministry of Power, Works and Housing (FMPWH), Federal Ministry of Environment (FMEEnv.), Federal Ministry of Finance (FMF), GIZ, Nigerian Electricity Regulatory Commission (NERC), Nigeria Solar Capital Partners (NSCP), Lagos Energy ACADEMY (LEA); executing agencies, Project Board, project stakeholders, etc. Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct field missions to the Baseline project (Nigerian Solar Capital Partners' (NSCP) site) location site. The final MTR report should describe the full MTR approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review.

#### 5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR

The MTR team will assess the following four categories of project progress. See the *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for extended descriptions.

##### i Project Strategy

###### Project design:

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions.
- Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country?
- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

###### Results Framework/Log frame:

- Undertake a critical analysis of the project's Log frame indicators and targets, assess how "SMART" the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
- Are the project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
- Examine if progress so far has led to / or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
- Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART 'development' indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

##### ii Progress Towards Results Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

- Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; colour code progress in a "traffic light system" based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as "Not on target to be achieved" (red).

**Table: Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)**

Project Strategy	Indicator (if applicable)	Baseline Level	Level in 1 <sup>st</sup> PIR	Mid-Term Target	End of project Target	Mid-Term Level & Assessment	Achievement rating	Justification for Rating
Objective:								
Outcome 1:	Indicator 1:							
	Indicator 2:							
Outcome 2:	Indicator 3:							
	Indicator 4:							
	Etc.							
Etc.								

**Indicator keys**

Green = Achieved	Yellow = on target to be achieved	Red = not on target to be achieved
------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------------------------

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

- Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

**iii Project Implementation and Adaptive Management**

Management Arrangements:

- Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

Work Planning:

- Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
- Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
- Examine the use of the project’s results framework/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

Finance and co-finance:

- Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
- Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
- Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
- Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on cofinancing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual workplans?

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

- Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
- Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

#### Stakeholder Engagement:

- Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
- Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
- Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?

#### Reporting:

- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
- Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs, if applicable?)
- Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

#### Communications:

- Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
- Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)
- For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project's progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.

#### Sustainability

- Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.
- In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

#### Financial risks to sustainability:

- What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?

#### Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

- Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

#### Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

- Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

#### Environmental risks to sustainability:

- Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

### **Conclusions & Recommendations**

The MTR team will include a section of the report setting out the MTR's evidence-based conclusions, considering the findings.

Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report's executive summary. See the Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects for guidance on a recommendation table.

The MTR team should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

### Ratings

The MTR team will include its ratings of the project's results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in a MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table in the Executive Summary of the MTR report. See Annex E for ratings scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

**Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for Derisking Renewable Energy NAMA for the Nigerian Power Sector**

Measures	MTR achievements	Achievements description
<b>Project Strategy</b>	N/A	
<b>Progress Towards Results</b>	Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6-point scale)	
	Outcome 1 achievement ratings (rate 6-point scale)	
	Outcome 2 achievement ratings (rate 6-point scale rating)	
	Outcome 3 achievement rating (rate 6-point scale rating)	
	Etc.	
<b>Project implementation &amp; adaptive management</b>	(rate 6-point scale rating)	
<b>Sustainability</b>	(rate 4-point scale rating)	

## 6 TIMEFRAMES

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately twenty-one (21) days over a time period of six (6) weeks starting (01 February 2019), and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

Time Frame	Activity
7 <sup>th</sup> December, 2018	Application closes
Before 10 <sup>th</sup> January, 2018	Selected MTR Team
15 January, 2019	Prep the MTR Team (handover of Project Documents)
2 days (before 25 January 2019)	Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report
2 days	Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission
7 days (between 28 January 2019 and 15 February 2019)	MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits
Between 10-15 February 2019)	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings earliest end of MTR mission
7days (27 February 2019)	Preparing draft report
2 days (10 March 2019)	Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report
TBD	Preparation & Issue of Management Response
TBD	Expected date of full MTR completion

Options for site visit should be provided in the inception report

## 7. MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

S/N	Deliverables	Timeline	Payment
1	<b>MTR Inception Report</b> MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission: 15 January 2019	MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management 20%
2	<b>Presentation</b> Initial Findings	End of MTR mission: 15 February 2019	MTR Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit 30%
3	<b>Draft Final Report</b> Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission: 27 February 2019	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFF 30%

S/N	Deliverables	Timeline	Payment
4	<b>Final Report*</b> Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft: 10 March 2019	Sent to the Commissioning Unit 20%

\*The final MTR report must be in English.

## 8. MTR ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is UNDP Nigeria Country Office. The commissioning unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the MTR team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

## 9. TEAM COMPOSITION

A team of two independent consultants will conduct the MTR - one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one team expert, usually from the country of the project (Nigeria). The consultants cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

The selection of consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall "team" qualities in the following areas:

- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to UNDP/GEF Projects;
- Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations;
- Experience working in Nigeria, and knowledge of the policy landscape;
- Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years (experience in small-scale wind energy and mini-grids, as well as wind skills capacity building will be an added advantage); Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis;
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
- A Master's degree in (Engineering, Energy, Finance, Economics, Physics, Environment or Development Studies), or other closely related field.

## 10. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

10% of payment upon approval of the final MTR Inception Report 30% upon submission of the draft MTR report 60% upon finalization of the MTR report.

## 11. APPLICATION PROCESS

### Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

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

All application materials should be submitted electronically to [undpgefdrei@gmail.com](mailto:undpgefdrei@gmail.com) by **7<sup>th</sup> December, 2018**. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

**Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal:**

Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the technically qualified score above 70% with lowest prices financial proposal where the technical score will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. Part of awarding the contract will also be based on acceptance of UNDP's General Terms and Conditions.

**EVALUATION CRITERIA**

- Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years; 30 POINTS
- Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations; 25 POINTS
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to UNDP/GEF Projects; 10 POINTS
- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies; 10 POINTS
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios; 5 POINTS
- Experience working in Nigeria, and knowledge of the policy landscape; 10 POINTS
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset; 5 POINTS
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis; 5 POINTS
- A Master's degree in (Engineering, Energy, Finance, Economics, Physics, Environment or Development Studies), or other closely related field. 10 POINTS
- Excellent communication skills; 5 POINTS
- Demonstrable analytical skills; 5 POINTS