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) set out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the Disaster Risk and Energy Access Management project (PIMS 5186)

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

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: | Disaster Risk & Energy Access Management (DREAM): Promoting Solar Photovoltaic Systems in Public Buildings for Clean Energy Access, Increased Climate Resilience and Disaster Risk Management | | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | | 5453 |  | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | | 5186 | GEF financing: | $ 1,726,484 | $ 1,726,484 |
| Country: | | Barbados | IA/EA own: | $ 400,000 | $ 400,000 |
| Region: | | Latin America & the Caribbean | Government: | $ 30,500,000 |  |
| Focal Area: | | Climate Change - Mitigation | Other: |  |  |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | | 1.5.1 Solutions adopted to achieve universal access to clean, affordable and sustainable energy  2.5.1 Solutions developed, financed and applied at scale for energy efficiency and transformation to clean energy and zero-carbon development, for poverty eradication and structural transformation | Total co-financing: | $ 30, 900,000 | $ 30, 900,000 |
| Executing Agency: | | UNDP | Total Project Cost: | 32,626,484 | 32,626,484 |
| Other Partners involved: | | Ministry of Energy and Water Resources | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | December 14, 2015 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed:  28 December 2018 | Actual:  30 November 2019 |

Objective and Scope

The objective of the Disaster Risk & Energy Access Management (DREAM): Promoting Solar Photovoltaic Systems in Public Buildings for Clean Energy Access, Increased Climate Resilience and Disaster Risk Management (DREAM) project is to reduce GHG emissions from fossil fuel-based power generation by demonstrating the exploitation of renewable energy resources for electricity generation in Barbados. To achieve this objective and strengthen the country’s Disaster Risk Response (DRR), the Project will promote decentralized solar photo-voltaic electricity generation in Barbados at community development centers and poly-clinics throughout the country. Project activities will include (i) the strengthening of the country’s renewable energy policy framework including a grid stability analysis and assistance in the strategic planning of RE investments; (ii) increasing the awareness and capacities of appropriate institutions and individuals to support RE developments in Barbados; and (iii) installations of solar-PV demonstration projects at community development centers, polyclinics and schools. The lessons learned from the demonstration projects will be utilized to scale-up investments for other solar-PV and RE installations in the public and private sector, all aimed at achieving a greater share of RE in the energy mix of Barbados.

These objectives will be achieved through the removal of systemic barriers at the national level, through the following project components:

**Component 1: Renewable energy policy framework:** This component addresses the barrier concerning policy gaps in the regulatory framework that would fully address the realization of the market potential for solar-PV in Barbados under the targets of SEFB and provide more confidence to potential investors of the opportunities for solar-PV investments in Barbados. The expected outcome from the outputs that will be delivered by the activities that will be carried out under this component is the formulation of clear policy and regulations supported by a solar-PV action plan and an approved and enforced licensing regime that will promote broad-based renewable energy generation in Barbados.

**Component 2: Clean energy capacity development**. This component is intended to address the barriers associated with the lack of capacity in Barbados to plan, design, implement, operate and maintain RE projects. The expected outcome from the deliverables of the activities to be conducted under this component is raised awareness and increased capacity of government personnel, local entrepreneurs and tradesmen to support the scaled-up development of solar-PV installations in Barbados and by geographic extension, other CARICOM countries. The outputs from this component will contribute to the: (a) awareness of policymakers and government personnel with significant roles in RE development, primarily within ECRE and BL&P; and (b) strengthening the capacity of technical and trades personnel from Barbados-based private sector contractors and supply entrepreneurs as well as similar personnel from other CARICOM countries.

**Component 3: Solar PV installations**: This component will address the barrier of low capacity and low level of awareness of the feasibility of solar-PV installations in Barbados. This component will provide support and investment towards the demonstration of sustainable solar-PV installation business models in Barbados to potential investors.

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method[[1]](#footnote-1) for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact, as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. **The evaluation must analyse the project through the lens of these five criteria and provide comprehensive recommendations based on findings in each of these areas, as relevant.** A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR ([Annex C](#_TOR_Annex_C:)) The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is **credible, reliable** and **useful**. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, including GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders.

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

The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Barbados to undertake site visits and carry out relevant data collection. There are over 30 sites where interventions have been made under DREAM and the following is representative list proposed for site visits:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Site Name** | **Description of System Installed** |
|  |  |
| Haggatt Hall Resource Centre, Robert Ten Rd. Haggatt Hall, St. Michael | 7.5kWp grid tied battery back-up system. |
| Drax Hall Resource Centre, Lower Section Drax Hall, St. George | 5kWp grid tied battery back-up system |
| Ivy Community Centre, Black Ivy, St. Michael | 2.5kWp grid tied battery back-up system |
| Charles F. Broome Primary School, Government Hill, St. Michael  All Saints Primary School, Pleasant Hall, St. Peter  Hillaby Turners Hall Primary School, Dunscombe St. Thomas | These hurricane shelters were previously outfitted with a battery back-up PV system under a different project. The DREAM project facilitated the electrical modifications needed to enable these existing PV systems to supply the lighting and power in critical areas. |
| Dover Pavilion, Dover, Christ Church | 2.5kWp grid tied battery back-up system |
|  |  |
| Bayville Community Centre, Field Place Bayville, St. Michael | 2.5kWp grid tied battery back-up system |
| David Thompson Health & Social Services Complex (St. John Polyclinic) | This is the largest installation at 50kWp. It is also the newest of the polyclinics in the island. |
| Bradford Taitt Polyclinic, Black Rock, St. Michael | 15kWp grid tied system |
|  |  |

The following is an indicative list of the individuals/institutions whose views should be fully reflected in the final report.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Agency/Department** | **Contact Information** |
| Ms. Danielle Evanson | Programme Manager, Environment, Energy and Climate Change | danielle.evanson@undp.org |
| Mr. Allan Franklin | Programme Specialist, Environment, Energy and Climate Change | allan.franklin@undp.org |
| Ms. Destine Gay | National Project Coordinator (DREAM), UNDP / MEWR | destine.gay@undp.org |
| Mr. Stuart Bannister | Technical Officer (DREAM), UNDP/MEWR | stuart.bannister@undp.org |
| Ms. Francine Blackman | Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Energy and Water Resources (NPD) | fblackman@energy.gov.bb |
| Ms. Heather Sealy | Deputy Chief Electrical Officer, GEED | heather.sealy@publicworks.gov.bb |
| Mr. Ronald Thompson | Senior Technical Officer, National Sports Council | nsc-bdos@caribsurf.com |
| Ms. Sandra Greenidge | Chief Community Development Officer, Community Development Department | sandra.Greenidge@barbados.gov.bb |
| Ms. Bridgette Marshall-Griffith | N/CVQ Coordinator, Community Development Department | Bridgette.Marshall-Griffith@barbados.gov.bb |
| Ms. Naomi Cumberbatch | Public Investment Unit | naomi.cumberbatch@barbados.gov.bb |
| Ms. Marica Strickland | Public Investment Unit | marica.strickland@barbados.gov.bb |
| Ms. Joy-Anne Johnston | Programme Officer, Disaster Emergency Management | anne.Johnson@barbados.gov.bb |
| Ms. Gina Belle | Project Coordinator, Ministry of Environment and Drainage (GEF Operational Focal Point) | gina.belle@barbados.gov.bb |
| Ms. June Chandler | Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Health and Wellness | june.chadler@health.gov.bb |
| Mr. Dave Thorne | Head of Technical Management Unit, Ministry of Health and Wellness | Dave.thorne@health.gov.bb |
| Mr. Keith Codrington | Maintenance Supervisor, Ministry of Education, Technology and Vocational Training | kcodrington3000@hotmail.com |
| Ms. Joan Bourne | Engineering Manager, Planning/Projects, Barbados Light and Power Co. Ltd. | joan.bourne@blpc.com.bb |
| Mr. Carlos Edwards | Managing Director, Enermax Ltd. | enermax@caribsurf.com |
| Mr. Akeil Haynes | Managing Director, NRG Solar & Renewables Ltd. | ahaynes@nrgrenewables.com |
| Mr. Christopher Reid | Solar PV Installation NVQ candidate  2/3 Trainees, individuals to comment on their training experience) | kris-reid@hotmail.com |
| Mr. Maurice Hope | Solar PV Installation NVQ candidate | 837-0728, no email contact |
| Mr. Colin Harewood | Community Centre Aide at Haggatt Hall Resource Centre | haggatthall.rc@gmail.com |
| XXXX | 5/10 members of the community that use the centres |  |

Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework ( [Annex A](#_TOR_Annex_A:)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. As noted, 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: |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **5. Impact** | ***rating*** |
| Environmental Status Improvement |  |
| Environmental Stress Reduction |  |
| Progress towards Stress/ Status change |  |
| **OVERALL PROJECT RESULTS** |  |

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 Multi-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 comprehensively assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender. The project should be comprehensively reviewed and critically assessed with reference to the relevant UNDP Gender Strategy (2014-2017). This analysis should provide a basis for understanding how effectively the project addressed gender and other cross-cutting issues and the extent to which it reflected an appreciation of the nexus between energy and sustainable human development.

Impact

The evaluators will assess the degree to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, **c) energy-related impact results (emissions avoided, energy saved, increase in installed renewable energy capacity), d) leveraged new sources of financing and investment** and/or e) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.[[2]](#footnote-2)

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions, recommendations and lessons**. In order for these recommendations and lessons to be useful, they should be presented with a clear, logical connection to the findings and results of the evaluation. This section should therefore reflect on the triangulation of information from various sources, including document reviews, inclusive stakeholder feedback and strategic site visits. Recommendations should be categorized for key stakeholders, including UNDP, with proposed actions and responsibilities identified to enhance the impact of the current project as well as inform the design and implementation of future interventions.

Implementation arrangements

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

Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be *20* days according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Time Required | Deadline |
| **Preparation (Inception Report)** | *3* days | *5 business days after contract signature* |
| **Evaluation Mission** | *5* days | *15 business days after contract signature* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | *8* days | *30 business days after contract signature* |
| **Final Report** | *4* days | *40 business days after contract signature* |

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluator is expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content | Responsibilities |
| **Inception Report** | Following the inception meeting, the Evaluator provides a report on the discussion and agreements on timing, methodology and coverage | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO |
| **Preliminary Findings** | Presentation of initial feedback from the triangulation of document reviews, field mission, remote interviews and other data collected. | To project management, UNDP CO |
| **Draft Final Report** | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report | Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC. |

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

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

Team Composition

The evaluation will be undertaken by one (1) international evaluator with experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience in the evaluation of GEF-financed projects is a distinct advantage, supported further by experience in conducting evaluations in the Caribbean. 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 Evaluator must meet the minimum requirements: present the following qualifications:

* Minimum of 10 years of professional experience in evaluations, with a specific emphasis on results‐based monitoring and impact evaluations for sustainable development programmes/projects;
* At least 5 years of experience and knowledge in UNDP and GEF Evaluations
* At least 5 years of experience and knowledge in evaluating development cooperation projects related to climate change and/or energy
* Technical knowledge in climate change mitigation is an asset
* Prior experience working in the Caribbean is an asset.

Evaluator Ethics

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

Payment modalities and specifications

Payment will be remitted to the Evaluator based on the following schedule:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Percentage of Contract | Milestone |
| *10%* | On submission and approval of Inception Report and work plan |
| *20%* | On presentation of preliminary findings |
| *30%* | Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report |
| *40%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report |

Application process

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

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

Annex A: Project Logical Framework

|  |
| --- |
| **Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one): 1. Mainstreaming environment and energy OR 2. Catalyzing environmental finance OR 3. Promote climate change adaptation OR 4. Expanding access to environmental and energy services for the poor.** |
| **Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: GEF-5 CC4 Strategic Program SP3:** Increased production of renewable energy in electricity grids |
| **Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:** Total avoided GHG emissions from on-grid RE electricity generation |
| **Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:** Market penetration of on-grid renewable energy (% from renewables); GHG emissions from electricity generation (tCO2eq/kWh); and $/tCO2eq |

|  | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Targets**  **End of Project** | **Source of verification** | **Assumptions** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Objective: [[3]](#footnote-3)**  Promotion of increased access to clean energy in Barbados through solar photo-voltaic systems in government buildings to strengthen the country’s climate resilience and disaster risk management | * Cumulative direct CO2 emission reductions resulting from the GEF-intervention * RE-based MWh electricity from the GEF intervention * Number of people using RE-based electricity * % share of RE in the power generation mix of Barbados | * 0 * 0 * 0 * 0 | * 276,895[[4]](#footnote-4) * 316,090 * 18,564 [[5]](#footnote-5) * 6.8 [[6]](#footnote-6) | * Project final report as well as annual surveys of energy consumption & reductions for each RE project | * Economic growth in the country will continue * Government support for RE development and utilization will not change |
| **Outcome 1:[[7]](#footnote-7)**  Strategic plans and licensing regime approved for accelerated RE development | * Number of strategic plans completed for RE development in Barbados with targets and milestones by Year 2 * Number of grid stability assessments on VRE penetration into the Barbados grid by EOP * Number of RE licenses that received direct Project assistance by EOP | * 0 * 0 * 0 | * 1[[8]](#footnote-8) * 1 [[9]](#footnote-9) * 6 | * Completed studies on RE policy/tariffs, and RE grid integration * Guidebooks on operational rules that assist DoET on developing RE power projects in Barbados * DoET project approvals * Annual reviews of key performance indicators of DoET Strategic Plan | * Continued government support for legislative and regulatory reform to promote and accelerate RE development * Capacity of government does not substantially delay approval of RE policies and RE projects |
| **Outcome 2:**  Institutional and technical capacity and awareness strengthened for clean energy development | * Number of persons attending awareness raising sessions at community centers with regards to the benefits of rooftop solar PV installations that actively seek the introduction of RE in their households/buildings/other infrastructure by EOP disaggregated by sex/gender * Number of persons under vocational training programs on solar PV technology and installations that are active in the RE sector by EOP, disaggregated by sex/gender * Number of tradespersons who have local certification to construct, assemble, operate and maintain RE technologies that are actively providing ESCO-type/other services by EOP disaggregated by sex/gender | * 0 * 0 * 0 | * 100 * 20 [[10]](#footnote-10) * 50 | * Workshop and seminar proceedings * RE training course materials * Training evaluations by participants | * Government budgets for technical training for RE are replenished on an annual basis |
| **Outcome 3:**  Feasible stand-alone solar PV electricity generation investments are successfully demonstrated | * MW of rooftop solar PV installations financed through GoB RE funds where DoET and BL&P have involvement in operationalization by Year 3 * MW capacity of rooftop solar PV projects in planning and design stages by EOP | * 0 * 0 | * 3.325 [[11]](#footnote-11) * 7.5 [[12]](#footnote-12) | * Bankable documents with business plans for RE demo projects * PPAs and approval permits to construct * Contract documents for construction and solar PV installations * Work inspection reports * Plans for additional rooftop solar PV installations in Barbados * Surveys of electricity consumption after solar-PV rooftop installations | * Sufficient annual replenishment of RE development funds * Capacity of government does not substantially delay approval of RE policies and RE projects |

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

The following is an indicative list of documents that must be reviewed as part of the evaluation process. These documents will be made available to the Evaluator following contract signature and prior to the Inception meeting.

1. *Project Document*
2. *PIF*
3. *Completed GEF Tracking Tool*
4. *Project Document*
5. *HACT Assessment*
6. *Inception Report*
7. *CDRs*
8. *FACE Forms*
9. *Quarterly Narrative Progress Reports*
10. *Financial Audit Reports*
11. *Asset Registry*
12. *Annual Reports (PIRs)*
13. *Site Visit/Field Reports*
14. *News/Media Reports*
15. *Training Reports (including participant feedback)*
16. *Sustainability Plan/Exit Strategy*
17. *Steering Committee Meeting Minutes*

Annex C: Evaluation Questions

| **Evaluative Criteria Questions** | | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels? | | | | |
|  | * Does the project relate to the GEF Climate Change focal area and has it been designed to deliver global environmental benefits in line with relevant international climate change objectives? | * The project includes the relevant GEF outcomes, outputs and indicators * The project makes explicit links with global climate action goals (e.g. SE4ALL) | * Project Document * GEF 5 Focal Area Strategies * PIF | * Desk Review of Documents |
|  | * Is the project aligned to National development objectives, broadly, and to national energy transition priorities specifically? | * The project design includes explicit links (indicators, outputs, outcomes) to the national development policy/national energy policies. | * Project Document * National development strategies, energy policies, Nationally Determined Contributions, etc. * PIF | * Desk Review of Documents |
|  | * Is the project relevant to stated regional development objectives as defined by CARICOM, OECS and other regional frameworks? | * Explicit links are made within the project to regional development policies, action plans and associated initiatives such as the CARICOM Energy Policy. | * Project Document * CARICOM Energy Policy * PIF | * Desk Review of Documents |
|  | * Is the project’s Theory of Change relevant to addressing the development challenge(s) identified? | * The Theory of Change clearly indicates how project interventions and projected results will contribute to the reduction of the three major barriers to low carbon development (Policy, institutional/technical capacity and financial) | * Project Document * PIF | * Desk Review of Documents |
|  | * Does the project directly and adequately address the needs of beneficiaries at local and regional levels? | * The Theory of Change clearly identifies beneficiary groups and defines how their capabilities will be enhanced by the project. | * Project Document * PIF | * Desk Review of Documents |
|  | * Is the project’s results framework relevant to the development challenges and are results at the appropriate level? | * The project results framework adequately measures impact * The project indicators are SMART * Indicator baselines are clearly defined and populated and milestones and targets are * The results framework is comprehensive and demonstrates systematic links to the theory of change | * Project Document * PIF | * Desk Review of Documents |
|  | * Is the project appropriately aligned with relevant UN system priorities, including thematic objectives at the national/regional and international levels? | * The project’s results framework includes relevant thematic outcomes and indicators from the UNDP Strategic Plan, the UNDAF, UNDP CPD and other relevant corporate objectives | * Project Document * UNDP CPD, UNDAF, SP | * Desk Review of Documents |
|  | * Have the relevant stakeholders been adequately identified and have their views, needs and rights been considered during design and implementation? | * The stakeholder mapping and associated engagement plan includes all relevant stakeholders and appropriate modalities for engagement. * Planning and implementation have been participatory and inclusive | * Stakeholder mapping/engagement plan and reporting * Quarterly Reports * Annual Reports (PIR) * Stakeholder Consultation Reports | * Desk Review of Documents * Stakeholder Interviews |
|  | * Have the interventions of the project been adequately considered in the context of other development activities being undertaken in the same or related thematic area? | * A Partnership framework has been developed that incorporates parallel initiatives, key partners and identifies complementarities | * Project Document * Quarterly Reports * Annual Reports (PIR) * Stakeholder mapping/engagement plan and reporting | * Desk Review of Documents * Stakeholder Interviews |
|  | * Have relevant lessons learned from previous projects informed the design, implementation, risk management and monitoring of the project? | * Lessons learned are explicitly identified and integrated into all aspects of the Project Document | * Project Document * PIF | * Desk Review of Documents |
|  | * Did the project design adequately identify, assess and design appropriate mitigation actions for the potential social and environmental risks posed by its interventions? | * The SES checklist was completed appropriately and all reasonable risks were identified with appropriate impact and probability ratings and risk mitigation measures specified | * Project Document * SES Annex | * Desk Review of Documents |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | | | |
|  | * Has the project achieved its output and outcome level objectives? | * The project has met or exceeded the output and outcome indicator end-of-project targets | * Quarterly Reports * Annual Reports (PIR) * Monitoring Reports * Beneficiary testimony * Site visit/field reports * Pilot Data Analysis/Reports | * Desk Review of Documents * Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries * Site visits | |
|  | * Were lessons learned captured and integrated into project planning and decision-making? | * Lessons learned have been captured periodically and/or at project end | * Steering Committee Meeting Minutes * Quarterly Reports * Annual Reports (PIR) | * Desk Review of Documents * Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries | |
|  | * How well were risks (including those identified in the Social and Environmental Screening (SES) Checklist), assumptions and impact drivers being managed? | * A clearly defined risk identification, categorization and mitigation strategy (updated risk log in ATLAS) | * ATLAS Risk Log * M&E Reports | * Desk Review of Documents * Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries | |
|  | * Were relevant counterparts from government and civil society involved in project implementation, including as part of the project steering committee? | * The steering committee participation included representatives from key institutions in Government | * Steering Committee Meeting Minutes | * Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries | |
|  | * Has the project contributed directly to any changes in legislation or policy in line with the project’s objectives? | * Draft legislation has been developed or enacted to catalyse the reduction of barriers to the increased penetration of renewable energy/energy efficient technologies | * Draft legislation * Policy Documents * Action/Implementation Plans | * Desk Review of Documents | |
|  | * Is there evidence that the project outcomes have contributed to better preparations to cope with natural disasters? | * The project has directly contributed to reductions in one or more vulnerabilities associated with natural disasters | * Quarterly Reports * Annual Reports (PIR) * Stakeholder/beneficiary testimony | * Desk Review of Documents * Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries | |
|  | * Has the project carefully considered the thematic issues related to human rights? In particular, has the project sought to and actively pursued equality of access to clean energy services and opportunities for women and men (i.e. project team composition, gender-related aspects of pollution impacts, stakeholder outreach to women’s groups, etc.) | * A gender mainstreaming plan was completed * The project results framework has incorporated gender equality considerations, as relevant. * Multi-dimensional poverty reduction is an explicit objective * The project prioritized the most vulnerable as key beneficiaries | * Gender Mainstreaming Plan * Project Document * Stakeholder analysis and engagement plan | * Desk Review of Documents | |
| * Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? | | | | | |
|  | * Did the project adjust dynamically to reflect changing national priorities/external evaluations during implementation to ensure it remained relevant? | * The project demonstrated adaptive management and changes were integrated into project planning and implementation through adjustments to annual work plans, budgets and activities * Changes to AWP/Budget were made based on mid-term or other external evaluation * Any changes to the project’s planned activities were approved by the Steering Committee * Any substantive changes (outcome-level changes) approved by the Steering Committee and donor, as required | * Annual Work Plans * Steering Committee Meeting Reports * Quarterly Reports * Annual Reports (PIR) * Stakeholder/beneficiary testimony * Revised Project Results Framework | * Desk Review of Documents * Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries | |
|  | * To what extent were the Project results delivered with the greatest value for money? | * Value for money analyses, requests for information, market surveys and other market intelligence were undertaken for key procurements. * Procurement is done on a competitive basis, where relevant. | * VFM, RFI, Market Surveys * Procurement Evaluation Documents | * Desk Review of Documents * Interviews with project staff and government stakeholders | |
|  | * Was co-financing adequately estimated during project design (sources, type, value, relevance), tracked during implementation and what were the reasons for any differences between expected and realised co-financing? | * Co-financing was realized in keeping with original estimates * Co-financing was tracked continuously throughout the project lifecycle and deviations identified and alternative sources identified * Co-financiers were actively engaged throughout project implementation | * Annual Work Plans * Steering Committee Meeting Reports * Quarterly Reports * Annual Reports (PIR) | * Desk Review of Documents * Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries | |
|  | * Was the level of implementation support provided by UNDP adequate and in keeping with the implementation modality and any related agreements (i.e. LOA)? | * Technical support to the Executing Agency and project team were timely and of acceptable quality. * Management inputs and processes, including budgeting and procurement, were adequate | * LOA (s)/Cooperation Agreement(s) * UNDP project support documents (emails, procurement/recruitment documents) * Quarterly Reports * Annual Reports (PIR) | * Desk Review of Documents * Interviews with project staff, UNDP personnel | |
|  | * Have the capacities of the executing institution(s) and counterparts been properly considered when the project was designed? | * An ex-ante analysis was undertaken of the internal control framework and internal capacities of the IP * An ex-ante capacity analysis was undertaken of key partners with explicit responsibilities for implementation of project funds * The cash transfer modality and implementation modality appropriately reflected the findings of any ex-ante analyses | * HACT Assessment(s) * Capacity Assessments | * Desk Review of Documents | |
|  | * Has the M&E plan been well-formulated, and has it served as an effective tool to support project implementation. | * The M&E plan has an adequate budget and was adequately funded * The logical framework was used during implementation as a management and M&E tool * There was compliance with the financial and narrative reporting requirements (timeliness and quality) * Monitoring and reporting has been at both the activity and results levels | * Project Document * M&E Plan * AWPs * FACE forms * Quarterly Narrative Reports * Site visit reports | * Desk Review of Documents * Interviews with project staff and government stakeholders | |
|  | * Has the project adequately used relevant national systems (procurement, recruitment, payments) for project implementation where possible? | * Use of national systems was in keeping with relevant national requirements and internal control frameworks * Management of financial resources has been in line with accounting best practice * Management of project assets has been in line with accounting best practice | * Procurement/Recruitment reports * FACE forms * CDRs | * Desk Review of Documents * Interviews with project staff and government stakeholders | |
|  | * Were financial audit/spot check findings adequately addressed and relevant changes made to improve financial management? | * Appropriate management responses and associated actions were taken in response to audit/spot check findings. * Successive audits demonstrated improvements in financial management practices | * Project Audit Reports | * Desk Review of Documents | |
| * Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | | | |
|  | * Are there financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes? | * The exit strategy includes explicit interventions to ensure financial sustainability of relevant activities | * Project Exit Strategy * Risk Log | * Desk Review of Documents | |
|  | * Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits? | * The exit strategy identifies relevant socio-political risks and includes explicit interventions to mitigate same | * Project Exit Strategy * Risk Log | * Desk Review of Documents | |
|  | * Have key stakeholders identified their interest in project benefits beyond project-end and accepted responsibility for ensuring that project benefits continue to flow? | * Key stakeholders are assigned specific, agreed roles and responsibilities outlined in the exit strategy * MOU(s) exist for on-going monitoring, maintenance and oversight of phased down or phased over activities | * Project Exit Strategy * Risk Log * MOU(s) | * Desk Review of Documents | |
|  | * Are there ongoing activities that may pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outcomes? | * The exit strategy identifies relevant environmental risks and includes explicit interventions to mitigate same | * Project Exit Strategy * Risk Log | * Desk Review of Documents | |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?** | | | | | |
|  | * Are there verifiable improvements in ecological status, or reductions in ecological stress, that can be linked directly to project interventions? | * The project has contributed directly to improved ecological conditions, including through reduced GHG emissions for energy generation and transportation | * Quarterly Reports * Annual Reports (PIR) * Monitoring Reports * Pilot Data Analysis/Reports | * Desk Review of Documents * Site visits | |

Annex D: Rating Scales

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

Annex E: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

**Evaluators:**

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

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[13]](#footnote-13)**

**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[[14]](#footnote-14)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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[[15]](#footnote-15)) |
| **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[[16]](#footnote-16)) |
| **3.1** | Project Design / Formulation   * Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators) * Assumptions and Risks * Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design * Planned stakeholder participation * Replication approach * UNDP comparative advantage * Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector * Management arrangements |
| **3.2** | Project Implementation   * Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation) * Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region) * Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management * Project Finance: * Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*) * UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues |
| **3.3** | Project Results   * Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*) * Relevance(\*) * Effectiveness & Efficiency (\*) * Country ownership * Mainstreaming * Sustainability (\*) * Impact |
| **4.** | Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons   * Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project * Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project * Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives * Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success |
| **5.** | Annexes   * ToR * Itinerary * List of persons interviewed * Summary of field visits * List of documents reviewed * Evaluation Question Matrix * Questionnaire used and summary of results * Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form |

Annex G: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

*(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)*

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

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

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

UNDP GEF RTA

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

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

1. For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office:  [ROTI Handbook 2009](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROtI%20Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. *Objective (Atlas output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR* [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Lifetime direct emission reductions assuming a grid emissions factor of 0.876 tCO2eq/MWh [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Based on 6.8% of expected share of RE into country mix (100% electricity access rate of 273,000 population per IRENA Barbados country profile). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. This is based on the addition of 3.325 MW into the national Barbados grid to the expected 12.92 MW of installed capacity in the year 2015 (out of 239.1 MW total installed capacity); thus, including the rooftop solar PV installations for community/resource centres (40 x 2.5kWp), polyclinics (10 x 5kWp), and those installations listed on Para 45 with the exception that only 2.5 out of 10 MW of solar PV for government building rooftops will be installed during the GEF-funded phase of the Project [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. *All outcomes monitored annually in the APR/PIR.* [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Contents to meet the strategic plan for RE development in Barbados is provided under Output 1.2 [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. This would include meeting the terms of reference as described in Output 1.1 [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. To be implemented under an IDB-TA [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Ibid 35 [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Based on 7.5 out of the 10 MW of solar PV is in planning stages at EOP. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)